

ary

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION
PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS TO FOSTER
RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Vol. XII

MAY, 1944

No. 2

WAR-TIME TEACHING OF RELIGION	<i>Clarence P. Shedd and Granville Walker</i>	75
HAS THE BIBLICAL SCHOLAR FAILED THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR?	<i>Ernest J. Chave</i>	83
THE BIBLE IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION	<i>Floyd V. Filson</i>	87
HAVE THE SPECIALISTS FAILED THE PASTOR?	<i>George M. Gibson</i>	92
A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO HEBREW RELIGION	<i>Herbert G. May</i>	98
THIRTY-SIX OPINIONS ON PRE-SEMINARY STUDIES	<i>J. Paul Williams</i>	107
EDITORIAL: RELIGIOUS DYNAMICS	<i>Carl E. Purinton</i>	110
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:		
A TRIBUTE TO DR. ISMAR J. PERITZ	<i>Elmer W. K. Mould</i>	113
DR. CHAVE REPLIES TO DR. FILSON AND DR. GIBSON	<i>Ernest J. Chave</i>	113
HERBERT G. MAY REPLIES TO LOUIS WALLIS	<i>Herbert G. May</i>	114
BOOK REVIEWS:		
THOMAS, GEORGE F., (Ed.), THE VITALITY OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION	<i>By Walter M. Horton</i>	115
MILLER, RANDOLPH C., AND SHIRES, HENRY H., CHRISTIANITY AND THE CONTEMPORARY SCENE	<i>By Thomas S. Kepler</i>	115
MORRISON, CHARLES C., THE CHRISTIAN AND THE WAR	<i>By Ivan G. Grimshaw</i>	118
JAEGER, WERNER, PAIDEIA: THE IDEALS OF GREEK CULTURE Vol. III	<i>By Robert H. Pfeiffer</i>	117
BRATTON, FRED G., THE LEGACY OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT	<i>By Edgar S. Brightman</i>	118
CONKLIN, EDWIN G., MAN: REAL AND IDEAL	<i>By Edgar S. Brightman</i>	119
TITUS, HAROLD H., WHAT IS A MATURE MORALITY?	<i>By Herman A. Brautigam</i>	120
BRUNNER, EMIL, THE DIVINE-HUMAN ENCOUNTER	<i>By Edgar S. Brightman</i>	121
WRIGHT, G. ERNEST, THE CHALLENGE OF ISRAEL'S FAITH	<i>By Miller Burrows</i>	122
LEWIS, C. S., THE PROBLEM OF PAIN	<i>By John M. Moore</i>	123
KUNKEL, FRITZ, IN SEARCH OF MATURITY	<i>By Peter A. Betrocci</i>	124
BAILEY, ALBERT E., DAILY LIFE IN BIBLE TIMES	<i>By Eugene S. Ashton</i>	125
SANDERS, J. N., THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN THE EARLY CHURCH	<i>By Mary Ely Lyman</i>	126
SCOTT, ERNEST F., THE VARIETIES OF NEW TESTAMENT RELIGION	<i>By Earle E. Cairns</i>	128

LOWRIE, WALTER, THE SHORT STORY OF JESUS	129
By Amos N. Wilder	
KEPLER, THOMAS E., CONTEMPORARY THINKING ABOUT JESUS	130
By Elmer W. K. Mould	
LOWRIE, WALTER, A SHORT LIFE OF KIERKEGAARD	131
By Carl E. Purinton	
SHEED, F. J. (TRANSLATOR), THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.....	132
By Carl E. Purinton	
STEERE, DOUGLAS V., ON BEGINNING FROM WITHIN	133
By Elmer E. Voelkel	
FROST, S. E. JR., SACRED WRITINGS OF THE WORLD'S GREAT RELIGIONS.....	133
By Horace T. Hough	
ALBRIGHT, W. F., THE EXCAVATION OF TELL BEIT MIRSIM.....	134
By J. Philip Hyatt	
ROSENBLATT, SAMUEL, THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK	135
By W. F. Stinespring	
CARMER, CARL, THE WAR AGAINST GOD	135
By Paul F. Laubenstein	
BOOK NOTICES	138
BOOKS RECEIVED	139
THE ASSOCIATION:	
THE CHICAGO MEETING	137
PERSONNEL	137
MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION	139

THE CONTRIBUTORS' COLUMN

CLARENCE PROUTY SHEDD is Stephen Merrell Clement Professor of Christian Methods in Yale Divinity School.

GRANVILLE THOMAS WALKER is pastor of the University Christian Church at Fort Worth, Texas. The purpose of their joint study was two-fold: first, to get the facts regarding the effect of the war on the teaching of religion to undergraduates; second, to see what kind of adjustment, if any, was being made by teachers of religion to the new situation.

The symposium on "The Bible in Religious Education" consists of papers read before members of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research meeting jointly with the Mid-western branch of the N.A.B.I. at McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, January 15, 1944. ERNEST J. CHAVE is Professor of Religious Education in The Divinity School of the University of Chicago. FLOYD V. FILSON is Professor of New Testament Literature and History at McCormick Theological Seminary and currently President of the National Association of Biblical Instructors. GEORGE M. GIBSON is Pastor of the Hyde Park United Church, Chicago.

HERBERT GORDON MAY is Associate Professor of Old Testament at the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College. He is co-author of *Culture and Conscience, An Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine* (with W. C. Graham) and *The Material Remains of the Megiddo Cult* (with R. M. Engberg).

J. PAUL WILLIAMS is chairman of the Department of Religion at Mount Holyoke College and Visiting Professor in the School of Religious Education at the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Published in February, May, August and November by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey. Editorial Office, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, 75 cents. Entered as second-class matter February 14, 1939, at the post office at Somerville, New Jersey, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

VOLUME XII

MAY, 1944

PART 2

War-Time Adjustments in Teaching Religion

CLARENCE P. SHEDD AND GRANVILLE T. WALKER

AT three periods between January 1943 and January 1944 correspondence was carried on by the authors with more than one hundred professors of Bible and religion in American colleges. Every section of the country and type of institution was included in this inquiry. The questions raised covered such problems as enrollments, dropping of courses, new courses, curtailment of personnel, religious instruction of military personnel and the relationship of departments of religion to the ongoing campus religious program for civilians and trainees of chapel, Christian Associations and churches. The data which came to the authors between January and July reflected the confusion of the period, making generalizations difficult and misleading, and this led the authors to initiate the second and third inquiries in late August and December. A correlative study has been undertaken by Professor Shedd's graduate seminar in Religion in Higher Education dealing with religious program for trainees and civilians on 200 moderate-sized, church-related and private college campuses where there are military units. Some of the more encouraging findings of this study will appear in the May issue of *Communiqué*, the bulletin of the War Emergency Council for Student Christian Work. The present article depends on data from both these studies. It is more concerned with presenting a faithful picture of leading facts and convictions than it is with documentation by statistical tables.

Recently a distinguished publicist wrote: "I assume that religion is a war casualty on the college campus." *Religion*, far from being a war casualty, has fared better than other aspects of the life of the liberal arts college, and in a good many colleges it is in a stronger position than it was in pre-war years. *The teaching of religion* has suffered more than have the informal ministries of religion through chapel, churches, and Student Christian Associations. Religious program, counseling and religious activities, in which trainees and civilian students have shared, have been encouraged and supported where other student activities have largely disappeared.

Thanks to the initiative taken in November, 1942, by national leaders of church student groups and Christian Associations in creating the War Emergency Council for Student Christian Work and the Inter-religious Council, the army or navy have placed upon the resident agencies of religion the responsibility for religious program and counseling of trainees. This is a fact of great importance for the post-war period. It means that the non-academic aspects of campus religious program (chapel, Christian Associations and church student programs) have been free to function in their own character, guiding, during the war period as in the past, students' thinking on the basic issues of faith and social concern. The situation has also greatly quickened united work, both on a Protestant and an interfaith basis.

The experience with religious program for army, navy and air force trainees during the past nine months has been so extensive that it is now possible to assert with confidence that, wherever there is competent and imaginative leadership, a good religious program—judged even by pre-war standards—for both civilian students and trainees is possible in any college where there are military units.

An encouraging aspect of the present situation is that quite a number of colleges, stirred by the needs of trainees, have for the first time initiated plans for leadership of campus religious life. An example is the magnificent ministry which is being carried forward at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, where the office of "resident chaplain" has been created by the joint action of the local YMCA, twenty-three local churches, and the Institute. It has the complete support of the resident commandant and officers of the several military units. "This work," says Chaplain Seymour Smith, "is proving to be a marvelous experience. It is just impossible to find time to give to all the phases of the program which should be covered." A student religious worker in a moderate-sized state university writes in the same vein, "The men in the ASTP unit have joined very enthusiastically and are a real part of our program. The cooperation between civilian students and soldiers is outstandingly fine." Widespread personal contacts with colleges and leaders across the country during the past 18 months confirm the impression gained from the questionnaire studies referred to above that *religion need not be a war casualty on any campus where there are military units*. This does not mean that pre-war ways of working are good enough; rather it means that, where there is determination to do so, ways can be found of "searchingly exposing" both trainee and civilian students to the insights and experiences of religion in ways that will be faith-

provoking and redemptive. Fortunately the experiences of colleges in religious program and counseling during the past twelve months is now available in a book written by Mr. Benjamin Schmoker of the University of Minnesota and published by Association Press (New York), entitled *A Handbook for the War-Time Campus*. This should be carefully studied by all teachers of religion and campus religious workers.

Working as we are with a bewildered generation of students who are facing the ultimate questions of the meaning of life and for whom, as British students said, "death is not a matter of twenty years or two years; it may come next month, next week, or tomorrow," the religious forces, curricular and extracurricular, must cease their "shadow boxing" and joins hands to make the resources of religious faith persuasively present and inescapable. Most collaborators in the studies on which this article is based would agree with Professor Robert E. Fitch of Occidental that "the general student attitude is unquestionably more favorable and more serious than it was before the war." Professor Robert Davis of Middlebury College adds, "It is even more serious among the Navy boys than among the civilian students." Contrary to the expectations of the dark days of November, 1942, intercollegiate religious conferences have taken a larger place in the religious life of colleges than in pre-war days. The 1943 summer student conferences, denominational and interdenominational, were largely attended. The recent Asilomar Conference for the Pacific Coast brought together more than 300 students. Week-end Christian student conferences seem to offer one of the best ways of doing religious work with trainees because of their strong desire to leave the campus week-ends and because such conferences offer a chance for fine co-educational fellowship. The annual mid-winter conferences of the Student Christian Movement of New England, re-

cently held at Hotel Northfield, turned away more students (most of them Army and Navy trainees) than were accepted because accommodations were only available for 250 students. This is especially significant since this conference deals fundamentally with questions of Christian faith.

That the teaching of religion has been drastically curtailed there can be no doubt. Because of the practical disappearance of civilian men students, the curtailment in the private men's colleges has been so great as to constitute a "dim-out," in a few cases a "black-out." In the women's colleges and among women in co-educational colleges enrollments in courses in religion have equalled or exceeded pre-war years. "The fact that many students," says Professor Marion Benedict of Sweet Briar, "feel the need of clarity in religion and the steady power of religion probably tends to increase interest" in courses in religion rather than the reverse. Realizing that for the next generation the cultural load of the nation and perhaps of the world will be carried by the young women now in college, the women's colleges feel, to quote President H. L. Smith of William Woods College, that they have a heavy responsibility for "preparing young women to make intelligent and Christian decisions as to the place of America in the post-war world."

The larger number of men's and co-educational colleges reporting show decreases in enrollment in religion courses ranging all the way from "slightly" to 80 per cent under normal. There are some marked exceptions, but on the whole the 1943-44 situation shows more colleges with reductions of 50 per cent to 75 per cent in religion courses than colleges maintaining 50 per cent or above of former enrollments. While acceleration and the pressure of technological studies are in part responsible, yet the primary cause, especially in the church-related and private colleges, is the progressive disappearance of civilian men

students. The trend downward in religion enrollments follows rather closely the drop in total enrollments and is even more closely correlated with the reductions in liberal arts enrollments. The smaller colleges are the ones that suffer most. The trend is seen more clearly in those liberal arts colleges which normally enroll from 500 to 1000 students. While there have been substantial increases in enrollments of women students, these have not been large enough to restore the normal college enrollments. Today there will rarely be as many as 100 civilian men students in these colleges and most of them have fewer than 50 men students. To pick a few colleges at random: the civilian enrollments at Berea are 489 women and 90 men students, at Rollins 252 women and 38 men, Alfred, 189 women and 74 men, Carleton, 569 women and 90 men, Washington and Lee, 118 men, Pomona, 399 women and 85 men, Lawrence, 358 women and 70 men, Hiram, 140 women and 40 men, Occidental, 360 women and 40 men, Allegheny, 400 women and 138 men, Baldwin Wallace, 330 women and 40 men, and Dickinson, 129 women and 87 men.

The reduction in enrollments of civilian men in the larger colleges and universities is in the same proportion but these institutions obviously have a much larger continuing body of civilian students and hence a better basis for continuing most of the academic disciplines involved in the liberal arts college. But, whether the college is large or small, the constituency for courses in religion has been drastically reduced and the enrollments of civilian men students have been reduced to a near-vanishing point. Colgate University—a men's college which in 1941-42 enrolled in religious courses 676 students, and in 1942-43, 463 students, has today only 70 students taking these courses. It should be noted, however, that this is 70 students out of 120 civilian students. Muhlenberg, which normally enrolls 225 students in Bible courses,

has today 17 students in these courses—4 of whom are Navy V-12 students. Bethany and Haverford, typical of many colleges, report a drop of 80 per cent in Bible enrollments. At Gustavus Adolphus where normally there are 500 to 600 taking courses in religion, the enrollments have dropped to 140. These illustrations could be indefinitely multiplied—but they would all tell the same story—one of drastic decrease in the number of "takers" of course in religion due to reduction in numbers of available students.

There are, however, a good many encouraging instances of departmental readjustments which have increased substantially the male enrollments,—in some cases leading to total enrollments larger than in the pre-war period. Emory reports that enrollments compare favorably with other years. There are more undergraduate students in religion courses at Yale this year than in any other recent year. This is due to the inclusion of Navy V-12 students in the basic Old Testament and New Testament courses given by Professor Sidney Lovett and the introduction, at the request both of the college and the army, of a course dealing with religion and health for army pre-medical students. Of 80 students enrolled in the Bible course, two-thirds are Navy V-12 students. Forty of the 140 students enrolled in Christianity courses at Gustavus Adolphus are Navy V-12 students. This college, discovering that the V-12 trainees had one hour available for free electives, added two one-hour courses to its curriculum. Occidental reports that 37 per cent of the students enrolled in philosophy are V-12 students. Quite a number of Princeton V-12 students are enrolled in religion courses. Colorado College, with two courses enrolling 36 students, finds that one-half of them are V-12 trainees. Denison, which has increased its staff in religion during the past 18 months and has also greatly increased its quota of women stu-

dents, reports the highest enrollment in religion courses in twenty years. Antioch attributes an increased interest in courses in religion to "a strong desire on the part of many students to balance their own training with courses dealing with life problems and values." Southwestern University reports that courses in religion are scheduled so that it is possible for naval trainees to attend and "they are urged to attend by both academic and naval authorities." Middlebury has condensed its half year courses into the 16 weeks term to fit into the Navy schedule; "we try to interpret the past in terms of today's world."

There is increasing evidence of the possibility of enrolling substantial numbers of Navy V-12 students in religion courses, providing adjustments are made in scheduling and methods to fit in the Navy training plans. Too many colleges with V-12 units seem to have proceeded on the assumption that this could not be done. Since we are likely to have V-12 students with us for a long time this experience in teaching religion to V-12 students deserves serious consideration by the more than 200 colleges having such units.

There is little evidence, however (except for a few isolated instances), of opportunity to enroll ASTP or Air Force Crew trainees in such curricular courses. Perhaps the substitution of ASTR units of 17-year-olds for the basic ASTP units may open the doors for the obviously needed instruction in religion for these youth who in the near future are to be called upon to fight for the freedom of religion as one of the four freedoms. There would be wide agreement with the professor of religion who writes: "To me, it appears that our government is failing seriously here in taking care of the morale of its men. They are all required to study some history, but they do not know the principles they are fighting for, nor do they grasp the *larger faith* that is needed to sustain them in their adventure."

in
och
s in
t of
ain-
ems
re-
miled
s to
by
es."
year
the
the
pos-
ses,
dul-
ning
units
tion
are
or a
relia-
con-
leges

cept
unity
ain-
the
olds
the
tion
near
the
free-
with
"To
ling
rale
study
the
they
sus-

Drastic reduction in enrollments has of necessity forced curtailment in course offerings. These curtailments are much greater than catalogs or correspondence reveal. The first courses to go have been those in religious education. Many other courses are "offered" for which there are "no takers." Many annual courses have been put on an every other year basis. Some courses are "announced but not offered." The well-known Colgate freshman course, called A Survey of Philosophy and Religion is offered, but it is no longer compulsory. Bethany which formerly offered 95 hours of religion now "offers four courses in any one semester." Amherst, a men's college, reports only one course remaining of four normally offered, and that in Christian ethics. Enrollments have dropped from 200 to less than 25. Haverford reports the dropping of all advanced courses and only two courses remaining, one on Bible and one on comparative religion. While by far the larger number of colleges reported "no courses dropped," yet more careful scrutiny of the replies shows that in most colleges radical reduction has taken place *in the number of religion courses in which students are enrolled.* While courses continue to be announced in catalogs and on schedules, they really are not given either because there are no students to elect them or they "have been postponed another year." Excepting where there is a large number of women students, majors in religion have all but disappeared.

This drop in courses and in enrollments has brought about radical readjustments in teaching personnel—more radical than the questionnaire replies suggested. A good many teachers of religion have taken leaves of absence for other forms of national and war service. By far the majority of colleges answered that, as yet, no curtailment in the teaching personnel had taken place, and that as for abandoning the chair of religion, such a move was unthinkable un-

less the whole liberal arts curriculum were abandoned. Many colleges wrote with some enthusiasm that administrative attitudes were good; in only one case was administrative policy questioned. Church colleges particularly insisted that religion would be taught as long as the college remained open, and they were inclined to single it out for special protection.

The fact that the fate of religion is to be found in the larger setting of the humanities generally was in most instances clearly understood and stated. Professor Henry Russell of Bowdoin writes: "In general I think it would be safe to say that religion courses will be offered at Bowdoin as long as there are students to take them." The reassuring note all the way through the replies was that everything was being done that could be done to keep the whole liberal arts program intact and that religion would not be allowed to suffer any more serious curtailments than other departments—in fact would be favored as a basic discipline in the present college situation. The president of one church-related college said that "he might find it necessary to let some people go if they desired, whose positions he would not fill for the interim, but that he intended to keep the position of the teacher of religion filled under all considerations; that he felt the necessity of perpetuation of religion even more than usual."

At Williams College, with the retirement of Professor James Bissett Pratt and the assignment of a colleague to teaching physics, the two courses in religion normally offered in the curriculum have disappeared. The lack of sufficient demand for religion courses in this men's college has made it seem inadvisable to appoint a new man to this place at the moment. Colgate, another men's college, which normally has a religion staff of five men, is now reduced to two men each of whom gives half time to other teaching. Bethany, with enrollments reduced by four-fifths, has lost two of its

teaching staff. These are not isolated instances.

The most serious decimation of teaching personnel has come, however, through the assignment of teachers of religion to the teaching for student trainees of courses outside of their field. A score of responses indicated that teaching in other fields than religion would be a necessity if teachers desired to stay. "Our entire faculty," writes one professor of religion, "has been asked to state what courses, if any, in other departments we could give if necessity arose for requiring us to go outside our own field." At Ohio University the chair of religion is to be saved by the fact that "more non-religious courses will be taught, or the instructor may even do some hours in 'sociology' or 'economics,' which courses will be more called for during war times." A professor in a large department of religion says, "All of us can remain if we go into the navy program, but probably one or two could carry on the department teaching in the future." Professor John W. Flight of Haverford presents a picture that can be regarded as typical. "The Biblical Literature Department has had such a long and fairly distinguished history at Haverford that it is hardly conceivable that it should be permanently dropped out in the near future. But it will doubtless suffer great eclipse for the duration, though its teaching personnel will be employed in the new specialized program . . . as well as in conducting sections of the pre-meteorology group in connection with History and English."

In order to ascertain what departments of religion are doing to meet the problems of students arising out of the war, the question was asked whether any new courses were being offered, by reason of the emergency. Forty responded that no new courses were being offered, but 14 of these indicated that these needs were being met within the framework of courses already

established. A score of colleges reported new courses arising out of the emergency. Four indicated that the department was participating in inter-departmental courses, giving special lectures on religion in courses dealing with various aspects of western culture and civilization.

A few samples will be given to indicate the range and variety of "new" courses being offered.

Birmingham-Southern: Two new courses: The Story of Christianity, and Civilizations of Asia. The first was put in as a "popular introduction to Church History . . . for ministerial students who for the present cannot go to seminaries, and others interested." The other, Civilizations of Asia, was offered "because of a realization that our students should have some introduction to the cultures and peoples of Asia."

Brothers College has added "The Church in the Modern World" which deals with the problems of the church now and at the close of the war." Vassar has a course upon the religious factors involved in war and reconstruction. Miami University is offering "Religion and the Problems of Life" as "a non-technical study of the resources of religion for the problems of living. In this course somewhat more emphasis is being given to positive religious values as related to the problems of students as they confront the present emergency." Berea College offers a new course on "Philosophical Values and the World Crisis" which is "a study of the present world crisis through analysis of the philosophical and religious roots of contemporary culture, and of the rôle of philosophic thought in the present conflict."

Bowdoin has a course on Modern Religious Problems. The approach is "philosophical rather than historical, using the writings of the 19th century thinkers, Fichte, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Tolstoy." "The need for such a course," writes

H. G. Russell, "I have felt both in my own thinking and in the demand of my students who want to deal more with the challenging and pressing religious problems of today and less with the historical problems of a millennium and more ago." The University of Tulsa is offering for the first time "The Religious Foundations of American Democracy." Likewise the College of the Ozarks is listing "Democratic Thought" as a new course. The need for a more thoroughly grounded appreciation of democracy was expressed also in other ways; some of the inter-departmental offerings, as will be seen, are also concerned with the religious aspect of this need.

An open-eyed statement about necessary changes comes from Davidson College: "If, as is not unlikely, most of our students are to be here for not more than two years, we should give briefer courses, more intensive, than we now do. What we are offering is predicated on a four-year stay in college. I do not think it is suited to a very short stay, and probably changes will be made here. Some concentration on brief courses in the essentials will probably seem advisable." In this connection the one-hour courses for Navy V-12 men offered by Gustavus Adolphus should be mentioned again.

Equally significant in meeting new needs is the fact that departments of religion are being called on to cooperate with other departments in the creation of inter-departmental courses which are reaching a considerably wider range of students. This information came voluntarily from five of the respondents: Denison, Colby, the University of Colorado, Princeton and Haverford. Professor Herbert Newman of Colby, for example, is guest lecturer to the History Department on the *Far East*, and expects to give a course in that department on Problems of the Far East. The Department of Religion at the University of Colorado is participating in a program of special lectures on "The Crisis in Culture." At

Haverford, the department contributes to a "communications course" in connection with the pre-meteorological unit. "Our function," writes Professor Flight, "is to give lectures at certain points in the course (perhaps a total of some 12 to 15 lectures) on subjects such as History of the Near East, Religions of the World—both Near and Far East—Religious Aspects of the Reformation Period, of American Revolutionary and Colonial Periods, etc." From Princeton, Professor George F. Thomas writes: ". . . a half dozen of us in the Humanities got an 'emergency' course through the faculty dealing with great classics from the ancient and modern world on the general topic 'Man and His Freedom in the Western Tradition.' Four weeks on the Bible and three on the fusion of the Christian and the classical strands in the early and medieval Christian era have been turned over to us to teach." The response of Princeton students—including Navy trainees—to this course has been excellent. At Denison, "the college is offering a trans-departmental course in Post-War Reconstruction, which is largely attended and which gets some religious emphasis, though only a little." "Antioch," says Professor Waldo Beach, "is planning a general curricular program for post-war reconstruction which will be a cover-all for course offerings, special conferences, research projects, etc. All this is keeping Antioch from losing the values of a long-range liberal arts ideal."

Two values aside from the actual material imparted in such courses would commend this kind of cooperation as a good thing for departments of religion to cultivate as extensively as possible. First, a much wider range of students, including especially the trainees, will be reached by these divisional courses with whatever message religion has to offer through the medium of teaching. Second, religion is seen in the context of a total cultural pattern rather than as an isolated subject to be studied.

Many colleges are using the framework of courses which have long had an established place in the curriculum to give emphasis to the current needs of students. This information came voluntarily from enough colleges to suggest that the practice is quite general. Professor George Thomas of Princeton writes: ". . . we are offering no new courses (in the department) because of the emergency. However, I am giving a greater emphasis in my course in Christian ethics and Modern Society to contemporary problems and trying to show that a revolution at home and abroad is occurring which Christians must help to carry through on as sound lines as possible." Westminster College in Pennsylvania, though offering no new courses, is attempting "to give new emphasis and new application to world and social conditions of lessons in Bible History, Ethics and Philosophy." Sweet Briar College likewise feels that "whatever we can contribute can find a place within our present courses. We feel that all the courses can gain fresh vitality in the present situation, and that all are needed by some students." Buel Trowbridge, before leaving Rollins for overseas service, wrote that he was offering no new courses. "The only change in emphasis," he says, "is to try to make each course speak to the condition of students about to enter the armed services, and help them to prepare for the serious trials and separations. I find I do not change my teaching when war comes on, for war seems to illustrate everything we have been saying."

A fact which needs to be heavily underscored is that while religion is far from being a war-time casualty on the college campus, *most colleges are falling far short of their possibilities either in curricular or extra-curricular religious program.* Too little courage and imagination have been shown in the adjustment of courses of religion and religious program of churches, Christian Associations, and the college to the urgent

personal, social and religious needs of men and women students—civilian and trainees. This is not a question of numbers of students enrolled in courses or in religious activities, but the deeper qualitative question of a total religious program—curricular and extra-curricular—which makes the resources of religion so persuasively present that trainees and civilian students alike find substantial help in living creatively and in making the grave decisions that this hour of history has imposed upon them.

On the whole a more relevant and constructive religious program has been developed for trainees in many of the larger state and private universities than in many of the smaller church-related and private colleges. Of course there are in the larger universities more men and women trained in the leadership of campus religious program. While many teachers of religion have been designated for the emergency as "civilian chaplains" and many others are serving on campus religious councils, yet too frequently these arrangements have been made without any lessening of teaching schedule or other academic responsibilities. There is probably a close correlation between this and the fact that many colleges, when the military units came to their campuses, assumed that little in the way of religious work could be done with and for trainees, hence they were defeated from the start.

There are many reasons for the limited success of colleges in meeting the emergency religious needs, but the one which stands out most sharply in the findings of this study is the wasteful use of teaching personnel. Why shouldn't most of the teachers of religion, whose time cannot fully be employed teaching religion, be asked to serve as directors of student religious life rather than being required to teach mathematics, history, or the sciences? Smaller colleges desperately need, now and in the post-war days, men set aside to give all or

(Concluded on page 139)

Has the Biblical Scholar Failed the Religious Educator?

ERNEST J. CHAVE

THE THREE questions of our symposium suggest the unfortunate separation of the specialized interests which religion has developed. It is a significant day when Biblical scholars invite some of their colleagues in the field of religion to sit with them for consideration of common problems. At a time when the whole world situation demands religious leadership we find a grievous lack of unity in the forces of religion and a sad inadequacy for the task. It is not strange that some people have tried to make a strategical withdrawal shifting the responsibility upon their deity. It is not strange that illiterate and uncritical minds have concocted all kinds of fantastic dreams in their blind outreach for help. The challenge to intelligent educated religious men and women who assume the role of religious leadership is humbling. In one generation we have seen two world wars, and some think another greater world conflict is yet beyond the horizon. Many careful thinkers fear more the coming problems of peace, or an armistice, than the difficulties of a global war. What are we as religious leaders, in our varied undertakings, doing to change world conditions, so that men and women, boys and girls, may have reasons for hope?

The seminary is just one school among many on a modern university campus, ignored for the most part by those who are busy in the other schools and departments. The church is one type of organization among many in our modern society, and has few inter-relationships with the others. People deal with religious ideas and practices as if they were inconsequential addenda to the rest of life or unimportant relics of an outgrown age. Leadership is

measured by one's following and the accomplishments of one's undertakings. Many religious leaders are discouraged and depressed. What is wrong? What can be done to change the situation?

First of all we should be glad if Biblical scholars would help us as religious educators to identify religion, and to find examples of religion in action. There are many illustrations in the records of ancient days of religion becoming decadent and corrupt in the temples and in the established practices. Yet the vital leavening power of religion has never died. It was frequently found where least expected, and a better form of religion arose out of the ashes of the old. Will the Biblical scholars tell us what they think of a functional definition of religion? Do we have good precedent and justification for trying to shift the focus of attention from doctrines and ceremonial practices to the spirit and operation of religion in the commonplaces of life? Should it be possible to indicate what is meant by spiritual life *growing* in a child, youth, or adult? Do we have worthy precedent when we attempt to tell what it is that stimulates growth, what hinders it, and how both individuals and groups should be expected to function if religion is a vital quality of everyday experience? As religious educators some of us have become convinced (1) that we can state the basic qualities of religion in functional terms so that they can be identified anywhere, (2) that religion with the finest qualities of spiritual life is growing fairly well in our democracy, and many different agencies are contributing to its growth, (3) that the church has a bigger opportunity than it ever had, and (4) religious leaders may have more thrilling tasks than ever before.

Briefly stated these are the ways in which, we believe, religion functions in modern society, and here are some of the questions the religious educator, would ask the Biblical scholar:

1. Religion gives growing persons a *sense of worth*, a feeling of being more than mere animals driven by blind impulses, more than mere mechanisms running on an instinct and habit level. Whenever and wherever growing persons are helped to understand the possibilities of living on this higher level, and develop desires to realize their possibilities, the ends of religion are being achieved. Do you as Biblical scholars believe this has always been an important factor in religion? And is this what Christianity is supposed to do better than any other religion?

2. Religion develops *social sensitivity*, respect of one person for another. It helps people to feel the mutuality of growing life, the interdependence of people. It seeks to call forth the spirit of brotherly love so that people control their social conduct by regard for others, and with desire to help others realize the fullness of their possibilities. You Biblical scholars know how this has grown from the narrow tribal concepts, through the messages of the prophets, to the spirit of Jesus.

3. Religion deals with the *appreciation of the universe*, a recognition of those forces and processes which permit the growth of personal-social values. While mankind develops skills in describing and using the latent forces of life, religion keeps asking the question as to what it all means in the growth of human values. What place does man have in this evolving universe? What is the nature of the ultimate? Religion has developed ideas of God, and man, and possibilities of a better day. You Biblical scholars know how much change there was even in the Biblical period. Can you help us as religious educators, to enable children, youths, and adults to gain a larger faith than has yet been expressed, a more

adequate conception of God, and a greater faith in man and his progress toward a better day?

4. Religion is an age-old process of growth, with *symbols and records* to indicate the different ideas and visions people have had in the past. It has grown by exchange of thought, by constant revision and re-evaluation of the highest forms of expression. The Bible is one record of a limited area of human experience, but all countries and people and periods of time have made their contributions to the growth of ideas and to the incorporation of them into the practices of life. Should not the Biblical scholar help the religious educator to get perspective, to mine out the treasures from all kinds of sources of past and present? Should the religious educator expect to get the needed racial experience, and proofs of the operation of the principles and ideals of religion, from this one collection of the Judaeo-Christian records? Is the Bible the best material to use in starting the educational program of children? Can we get the best theological concepts by limiting our study to the Bible, or can we expect boys and girls to be motivated to the best ways of living by using the Bible as their main text?

5. Religion is a development of *discrimination in values* with a readiness to sacrifice lesser values in order to achieve greater. Sacrifice has become for many a mere abstract concept, or a legalistic term in relation to a deity, but few have discovered it as the law of progress. Biblical scholars know how doctrines and practices have centered around sacrifice, and how prophets have struggled to clarify and purify the needed sacrificial spirit. Can they help the educator to show how it should operate in the commonplaces of life, from the cradle to the grave? Can we expect religion to make people more discriminating, more refined, and less bound by animal appetites and low or mediocre interests?

6. Religion is a *co-operative fellowship*, an identification of an individual with the groups to which he belongs, so that he seeks corporate as well as personal fulfillment. The Biblical scholar knows how this ideal of religion has been expressed in ideas of the chosen people, the church, and the kingdom of God. Can he help the religious educator to show that it must operate in the family, neighborhood, community, nation, and world family of nations? Can we be specific as to the kind of life which is desirable and give illustrations of its practicability and attractiveness?

7. Religion has always had special times, places and ceremonies for *group celebrations*. It has developed festivals, holy days, worship, anniversaries, and many means for keeping the focus of attention upon its highest values and goals. It has sought to strengthen the individual by participation in group activities where orientation, meditation, commitment, and re-vitalization are furthered by carefully planned services. The Biblical scholar knows how such services have grown and changed, how stereotypes have lost their meaning, and he may help us in what may be most effective. Can he help the religious educator to plan services, appropriate to this modern day, services which may help to integrate and direct the growth of personal-social values and achievements?

These statements sufficiently illustrate the functional meaning of religion. One can readily see that spiritual qualities are being affected by what happens to a child at home, at school, at play, as he listens to the radio, or as he watches a movie. Many forces are influencing his sense of worth, his social sensitivity, his understanding and appreciation of the universe, his feeling as to the reality of and manner of operations of God, his interest in ancient and modern records of human problems and attainments, his discrimination and readiness to pay the price for higher achievements, his

devotion to the church or loyalty to his family, his satisfaction in worship or regard for the Sabbath. None of us believes that a formal service once a week with most of the language drawn from unfamiliar sources is likely to accomplish very much, where, indeed, we all share in perpetuating futile forms. Many are giving careful thought to the improvement of these services but some of us feel that that alone can never be sufficient. We believe that it is necessary to study homes to help parents to function better, to study the systems of general education and to co-operate with leaders in that field, to know more about what is going on in all the varied agencies of our community and to work for higher ideals in every walk of life. When religion is interpreted functionally, along the lines indicated, we can see how it is possible to have allies everywhere, and to correct the forces which are hindering the best development of our boys and girls. This point of view multiplies the tasks of the religious educator and necessitates a broad and careful preparation for his work. He must know social psychology, sociology, and pedagogy, and he will not do a religious piece of work without an adequate religious philosophy, psychology of religion, and training in phases of practical ministry. He is expected to be up to date in problems of theology, Bible, church history, ethics, music and worship, recreation, counseling, and a number of other fields. Yet sometimes a religious educator in a church is merely a friendly supervisor of that layman's annex called the Sunday School, and a chore boy for the minister and other officers of the church. Pastors should think of all this work in educational terms and specialists should receive recognition and remuneration worthy of their responsibilities.

Instead of the question, "Has the religious educator neglected the Bible?" it might be fruitful to consider the opposite, "Has the Biblical scholar neglected religious edu-

cation?" and instead of the third question of our symposium, "Have the specialists failed the Pastor?" we might ask "Has the Pastor in his preparation overlooked the specialists, and does he give rightful place to religious education?" There are different ways of looking at every problem. At any rate while we have the chance to bombard both Biblical scholars and pastors may we ask a few more questions which seem related to our total education?

1. Does our experience teach us that religion should be emphasized as a pervasive force operating in all phases of life, and that it should be defined in functional terms so that the religious leader may work co-operatively with people in all types of organized human service? Can we hope to break down the duality of sacred and secular, integrating and unifying life by religion?

2. Does our experience cause us to want to transcend anthropomorphic concepts of God, and ancient forms of address in hymns, prayer, and ritual? Can we find language which will have regard for our growing knowledge of cosmic forces, universal processes, and human characteristics? Can we make use of developing racial experience to build a more realistic and challenging theology and religion?

3. As far as the Bible may be expected to contribute toward an understanding of religion, and toward the motivation of religious living, has enough research been done so that a few scholars might be released to work on other periods of literature? Are there not other areas of religious literature which ought to be studied intensively? Could some work be done on the evaluation and compilation of contemporary writings? Would it be too much to hope for a day when we might have chairs of ancient and modern religious literature in our seminaries instead of Old and New Testament? Would the tasks of religious education and pastoral ministry be served well by such seminary studies?

4. Are Biblical scholars free enough to criticize Biblio-latry? Are they willing to tell lesson writers that they do not honor the Bible, nor recognize the possibilities in religion when they feel compelled to quote scripture to give a teaching religious quality? Will they say plainly that much so-called Bible teaching is nothing more than reading into Bible language and setting foreign ideas and precepts? Will they face the total need and think with the religious educator on what Bible study should have in a program of religious education, and then help prepare suitable guides in Bible study?

5. Will the Biblical scholar help in the practical tasks of defining goals at each age level, selecting the best means for attaining those goals, appraising outcomes and refining methods, helping to make the church and religion effective forces for integrating and exalting all life? Will he use his scholarship, his historical perspective, his well-based faith, and his long-disciplined patience to work co-operatively with his colleagues trying to meet the world challenge of human need?

6. Will the Biblical scholar help us to bring the church back to the centre of community life, to enlarge the concepts and goals of religion, to stimulate the imagination of young people to become religious leaders who can function effectively in a modern world? Will the Biblical scholar and pastor help us to reshape the seminary program to train religious leaders for the responsibilities of community, national, and international leadership?

Finally, the religious educator has no desire to lay the blame for the shortcomings of religion in this critical hour of need upon either the Biblical scholar or the pastor. He does, however, want to present a hopeful picture of possibilities for a re-vitalized program of religion in the churches, denominations, seminaries, and in the country and world at large. We all assume rôles of

(Concluded on page 139)

The Role of the Bible in Christian Education

FLOYD V. FILSON

WHAT ROLE should the Bible play in the educational program of the Christian Church? I use this formulation of the question, first, because religion when vital is not general but specific, and second, because a healthy faith does not thrive in solitary existence, but lives in fellowship. As a member of the Christian Church, my interest is naturally in the Christian faith as fostered and expressed in the Church. My discussion deals not with the relation of the Bible to religious education in general but to the place of the Bible in Christian education.

The contributions of educators to the work of the Church are important, and the Biblical scholar joins with other groups in appreciation of these services. Better methods of teaching have been found. The interests of different age groups have been discovered. Psychology has received careful study and its help used in many ways. These advances are welcome. There can be no opposition to such valuable work. No question of method as such is involved in this discussion.

An issue arises only when method threatens to determine content. This has sometimes happened. Under the influence of ideas of "progressive education," there have been tendencies in some circles, which further experience and urgent world conditions have largely eliminated, to let the child determine the curriculum. Another expression of the same suspicious trend has been the idea, put forth by some advocates of "group work," that the group should evolve its program and determine what it will do. A further expression of the tendency to push content aside, to deny that any past events or records can have permanent and basic importance, some-

times comes to expression in the idea of the "functional approach" to the educational process.

It is difficult to discuss these dangers without being misunderstood. In the emphases on "child-centered curriculum," "group work," and the "functional approach" there is such an admirable respect for the personality, interests, and present needs of the child, and these conceptions are so well protected from extremes by most Christian educators, that it seems captious to insist upon the limits which these emphases must observe. Yet there are warnings which must be given:

1. To let the child or small group be the final arbiter of curriculum and program, or to let study of present function obscure the tremendous power and worth of inherited tradition, is miseducation for life, in which respect for social inheritance and control must play a large rôle.

2. Determination of curriculum by the individual or small group is thinly disguised humanism. To let a child or young person think that in matters of faith and moral life his will is the last word is in effect to bow God out of the picture. And if the functional approach is not coupled with a conviction that the present working of God is vitally linked with his significant working in the past, it is open to the same danger. God is no recent invention. Only a view which looks for light to God's working in the past can support a vital faith in the God of our present and future.

3. Exclusive attention to the above mentioned emphases inexcusably disregards the fellowship and function of the Church, which has a responsibility to its God, to itself, and to the child. The Church cannot

abdicate its ultimate control of curriculum and procedure.

4. To confine attention to present desires and functions ignores the nature of Christianity. Our faith is a historical religion. This does not mean simply that it has had a history, which it would be interesting and instructive for the child to know. The foundation of Christianity is in specific historical events which must never be neglected. It does not exist apart from contact with, and interpretation of, that history. Therefore Christianity is vitally and constantly linked with the special record of God's action for men which our Bible contains. The Bible gives us the indispensable connection with that special history and makes us feel its meaning.

To be sure, Christianity exists only where that Biblical message is vitalized and given contemporary reference by the Spirit of the living God. Moreover, the Spirit uses in its service all available intelligence, skill, and practical resourcefulness of man. But no present spiritual guidance ever takes the place of direct and steady use of the Bible. No immediate resources ever render obsolete or dispensable that work of God for man in the particular history which the Bible keeps before the Church.

It may be replied to these points that skilful teaching will guide the child to the right curriculum choices, and that proper application of the functional approach will draw on the heritage from the past to provide resources to meet the present. There is truth, but only partial truth, in these statements. Good teaching will not give the child the impression that with him rests the final judgment as to whether the historic Christian tradition is the content on which his study is based; it will not make the child think he is traveling an unmarked course. Nor will the teacher give the impression that in dealing with modern problems, as he must, he is under no definite commitment to the Christian tradition. My

purpose at this point is not to eliminate the proper freedom of pupil or teacher, or to block resourceful facing of present life situations. It is rather to protect the religious life of the pupil by insisting that he must face God's will, recognize God's working in history, and enter into the Church's heritage. He must not get the impression that the Church has no definite message to give him, or that he can neglect the historical content of the Christian faith without serious loss. In other words, the teacher must not be so clever that he defeats the very purpose of Christian education.

The conclusion to which the discussion has thus far led us is that the content of the Christian message, rooted in history and found in the Bible, takes precedence over method and must not be altered under the guise of improved method. The work of Christian education must be kept under the control of theological conviction. The history of God's redemptive working for men, and the vital record of that special history in the Bible, are basic for all educational work in the Church.

What does this conclusion imply with reference to the use of the Bible in Christian education? Five aspects of the answer to this question may be suggested:

1. Proper use of the Bible involves a continuous program of adult education. Indeed, that is the phase of education which looms largest in the training of which the Bible speaks or gives examples. In both the Old and New Testaments attention is devoted mainly to the teaching, exhortation, and challenging of adults. This fact is not mentioned here to suggest that our educators have ignored it. It is a matter of gratitude that they have given much attention to the better training of grown people. Yet the Bible would suggest an increased activity in this field. For it still remains true that entrance into the Church is the signal for stagnation in the lives of great numbers of its members. This is a

situation which causes alarm to all who see how much educational work there must always be with adults.

2. The right use of the Bible in Christian education requires that the Church must tell the Bible story to the pupils in its schools. It must make its children and older people familiar with the essential Bible content. They must learn the story of the events on which the Church is founded. This procedure the Bible itself illustrates. The children in Israel were to be instructed in what God had done for their people. The New Testament indicates that the children were to be taught the Scripture and the story of their faith. To take the Bible seriously demands that we do the same today. Pupils must get as clear as possible a picture of the Bible story and content.

This is particularly important in the Church's educational program in view of the actual conditions under which instruction is usually given. When but an hour or two a week is available, and close co-operation with the home cannot be expected, the Church must see that it tells its story in that brief time which it is able to control. Simply to make the short period one of worthy life experience is not a sufficient aim. In the brief available time the Bible is not merely a resource book for other central aims. Under the circumstances the Church must take care that instruction in the Bible story finds an essential place in the program. No one would want this to mean mere instruction in facts and history. But skilful use of the Bible to guide modern life does not exclude, and has no right to exclude, a systematic plan by which the pupil may learn the essential content of the Bible.

3. Adequate use of the Bible in Christian education involves giving the pupil the basic religious interpretation of life which the Bible presents. It is not enough to draw from it moral counsel and illustrations of social situations in which modern

human beings find themselves. The book must be used in harmony with its own witness. God is the one great axiom and center of the Bible. His action and will are the decisive factors. What he has done for men in Israel and in Christ is central in the message of the Church. In presenting this message, the Bible does not neglect the sin and need of men, but rather makes a clear and honest portrayal of man's faults and wants. The necessity of facing the will of God, finding his help and grace, and living in fellowship with him by his power, receive strong stress.

Thus the Bible interprets life, and right use of the Bible renders inescapable a frank and consistent application of theology in the educational program of the Church. We cannot simply tell the story. We have to interpret it. Teaching involves thinking. It also involves interpretation. A theological position, liberal or conservative, is inescapable. Christian education is inevitably an expression of theology. The more clearly educators see this, and the more skilfully they use their skills in the service of their theology, the more hopeful we may be of good results. Naturally, the educational program will give a very rudimentary expression of the mind of the Church in the early stages of the training of the child. The earlier years will be a time chiefly for telling the basic Christian story. As the child grows there can be a gradual advance in the degree of depth which the teaching attempts. But the Christian view of life must be presented from the outset.

In doing this there is no need to hide and shun all the ugly or mysterious facts of life. Indeed, the Church, with Good Friday and Easter in its calendar, cannot do an honest job of teaching without facing the facts of sin, death, and the mystery that is beyond our grasp. There is nothing unfortunate in this necessity. Children cannot be sheltered from all knowledge of dark factors or incomprehensible elements

in life, and it is better for them to learn faith's word in the face of these facts than for us to fear, as I know a few educators do fear, to present the truth to those in the children's division. We can make nothing of the Bible or of the church year if we do not deal honestly with the fact of wrongdoing, the fact of suffering, and the fact of God's redeeming love and working. An honest educational program will seek to present the Christian message in ways adapted to each age group, and it will of course keep a strong emphasis on the positive side, but it will not make its first years of instruction picture life as an easy push-over for goodness, nor will it give the child such a misconception of life that he feels able to meet it on his own resources.

Nothing in the acceptable results of critical Bible study militates against this position. To be sure, there have been fads of criticism which would undermine the life of the Church. It has been asserted that Jesus never lived, that the early Church and especially Paul completely perverted the message of Jesus, that Jesus was essentially important as a strong ethical teacher with great optimism about the innate, unaided goodness of men, and that the traditional message of the Church has been radically wrong. Such assertions do not stand the test of further study. After all sound critical study the Bible remains what the Church has known it to be. It presents a religious message of God, his will and his working for men in Israel and in Christ and in the Church, with the claim that this message is crucial for men's welfare now and in the future. Christian education must build at all stages on that religious interpretation of life, and must interpret that message afresh in the terms of our day.

4. The only teaching of the Bible which is in keeping with its nature and message is one which combines persuasive personal witness by the teacher with an opportunity

for radical decisions by the pupil. In the matters of faith and life of which the Bible speaks, objectivity is not the last or important word. Honesty there should be, but neutrality is out of the question. Perhaps the greatest possible misrepresentation of the Bible would be so to present it as to suggest either that the teacher has no position on the issues it presents or that the pupil need not take any stand concerning them. The Bible is outstanding in its challenge to the reader to respond to God's claim with gratitude and obedience.

In such witness and personal challenge the personality of the pupil must be respected. He must not be high-pressured into acceptance of what has no meaning or appeal to him. However, life being the urgent and inescapable thing it is, real respect for the personality of the pupil does not call for unbroken neutrality. It rather requires the teacher to say how much these things mean to him and how important it is for the pupil to take them seriously. It requires that opportunity be given for the pupil to make decisions and take stands which ally him with the Church and its work. No other method is true to life or to the Bible, which does not offer a coolly detached presentation of its message but frankly and vigorously tells its story as one of basic and permanent importance for men.

5. Satisfactory use of the Bible in Christian education will aim at building pupils into the life of the Church, of which Christian education is one phase. It must make pupils increasingly at home in the Scriptures, worship, and fellowship of the Church. It must make them good members of the Church and society.

It is worth while to speak specifically of one thing which must be done if we are to build children and young people into the life of the Church. We must give them an acquaintance with the traditional vocabulary of the Bible and the wider Christian heritage. This may seem a little thing,

but neglect of it is causing considerable difficulty. We have a fear of antiquated verbiage, and a determination to state our faith in modern terms. This is good up to a point; in fact, it is indispensable. But it may be carried so far and made so exclusive a technique that the pupils are estranged from the Church's heritage in the Bible, in hymns, and in other documents. We may foster an isolationism of our generation from its past.

This fear of old words, this tendency to use only words which children and young people know from current social life, is futile. Each area of life, especially one with historical roots, will unavoidably have its own vocabulary. Moreover, such divorce from traditional vocabulary is not necessary. It erroneously assumes that children cannot learn new words. If our

boys knew half as many terms about religion as they easily learn about airplanes in one year, they would be completely equipped for a graduate course in theology.

Furthermore, to state the fact decisive for Christian educators, it is not open to them to discard the traditional vocabulary. They have to link the life of the child with the Church and its heritage. There can be no continuity with the past and no appreciation of the Scriptures and hymns and services of the Church unless the Christian vocabulary is gradually acquired. The process must be well planned. But it presents a task which Christian education must accept and accomplish. For the function of Christian education is to develop, not trained hermits or spiritual free lances, but working members of the ongoing Christian Church.

Have the Specialists Failed the Pastor?

GEORGE M. GIBSON

THE CHRISTIAN ENTERPRISE goes forward by a diversity of gifts applied in a division of labor. The pastor, by the very nature of his appointment, has as his chief concern, the whole enterprise, and its whole Gospel. He feels the weight of an unpayable debt to the biblical scholars, religious educators, and countless other specialists, to each of whom in turn he is inferior in learning and training. He draws upon them all: upon the findings of the scholar for homiletic uses, the techniques of the pedagogue for teaching, and upon the many other disciplines for pastoral counseling, as he strives to mediate the whole Gospel to the separate person and the group.

But the pastor likewise feels the obligation of the specialist to the whole of which he is part, and upon which each specialist in turn must acknowledge dependence. Since there are many specialists in the division of labor, and much diversity among the gifts of the experts, there would be presumption in a general appraisal, whether appreciative or adverse. Yet the pastor may properly show concern for the problem of specialization itself with its inherent dangers to the wholeness of a Christian view of which he is exponent. That problem has attracted considerable attention in recent writing. In the present scope we may no more than give it a bare statement, then proceed to ask whether the specialists in religious fields have offended in aggravating the general situation.

The problem of specialization may be summed up in a brief series of propositions:

1. That the part is both judged and rescued by the Whole. The true significance of any separate discipline is the contribution it makes to the Whole. A spirit of dedication is therefore required of the

part, a consecration to and reverence for that Whole which extends beyond it. No gift in the general diversity, no work in the large division of labor, is self-contained. No part of the grand enterprise may claim independence, nor becomingly cultivate a spirit of indifference or arrogance toward the Whole. The problem of specialization is not that we are over-specialized, but that our specialties are under-consecrated. We are plagued with the tendency toward atomism among the various branches of the Christian enterprise, with the attendant indifference and arrogance of each toward the others and toward the Whole.

2. That specialization defeats itself when it becomes partialization. In true specialization, the critical function serves as a corrective and stimulus; in partialization this function is perverted into a habit of carping as an enjoyable end in itself. Specialization strives to bring truth to bear upon a particular problem for its better understanding that its solution may be a contribution to the whole. Partialization tends toward exclusiveness in a narrow field, loses the keen edge of self-criticism, and refuses serious examination of its rejections. Thus partialization not only violates the general truth, but by the same token distorts and falsifies its own interest.

3. That partialization by this process achieves the opposite of its original purposes and becomes subject to the same criticisms it offers. Thus, as the newer learning in any field begins with a critique of the old orthodoxy, its tendency, through partialization, is to become itself an orthodoxy possessing all the features which were the object of its criticism of the old. Its autonomous exclusivism is infected with totalitarian zeal, as it seeks to establish it-

self as a new system with its own tradition, tenets, authorities, symbolisms, and eschatology, its original curiosity for truth now blunted with self-satisfaction, (its spirit grown intolerant).

Somewhat along these lines Professor Whitehead pointed the difference between the Athenian and Alexandrian educational systems. The former held to the idea of the Whole, regarded the particular as forever subordinate to the general, and treated each special branch of learning as a chapel in the cathedral of truth. The Alexandrians, on the other hand, set themselves in separate and independent professional disciplines, each branch accruing its own authorities and traditions and having no relationships with the total enterprise. He observed that our modern American intellectual labor had followed the Alexandrian, rather than the Athenian pattern.

Ruskin observed this tendency in modern life, noting the neglect of capital Truth in the supposed interest of little lower case truths, and the hard separatism between the various human branches, notably that between art and morality. His judgment was that such an atomism not only violated the spirit of Truth, but rendered each little separate truth absurd. This is the burden of Dr. Hutchins' critique of general education.

It is our estimate of the present religious situation, that it may be described in terms of the process we have indicated. The modern religious mind, seen most characteristically in the specialty of religious education, is under test at this point. We may not here linger in an expression of appreciation for its fine original intentions or its certain excellent accomplishments. This is a critical article, and its scope does not allow a full expression of appreciation for the values contributed by this movement to the total Christian enterprise. We must begin with the observation that the movement is now under sharp criticism and strongly on the

defensive, an attitude which, according to Shailer Mathews is a mark of senility. In its very brief history thus far, it has succeeded in setting up a system which is but vaguely related to the historic and classic Christian frame of reference, and which remains Christian mainly by way of an idealistic influence while refusing serious consideration of the basic emphasis of the classic tradition. If we see this tendency more clearly marked in religious education than in biblical scholarship it may be because the former is more in the foreground of the everyday life of the Christian fellowship. However, my own feeling (not yet closely examined) is that biblical scholarship has not offended in the same manner, but on the other hand has maintained itself more as a part dedicated to the whole and rendering an intelligent contribution to the whole.

Our analysis must be sketchy, but it may give us opportunity to examine briefly the emphasis of religious education as compared to the historic Christian tradition, at a few crucial points:

i. *Epistemology.* The problem of knowledge is a major concern. It is a main item on the agenda wherever scientists, philosophers and theologians meet. The two approaches to truth under discussion are the empirical and the revelatory. More precisely, the debate seems to be between an exclusive empiricism which has no place at all for revelation; and a view of revelation which does recognize a legitimate function for the empirical method. I know of no modern view of revelation which totally rejects the method of investigation and logical analysis, although Karl Barth perilously approaches this in his distrust of all human enterprises. Religious education has largely adopted the empirical method, joining with a zeal for factual observation and measurement, a total distrust of revelation as offering a method to arrive at valid knowledge. Its tendency has been toward

an exclusive empiricism, with its attendant failure to examine seriously the questions: what happens in the experiences which have been called revelations? Is truth received by revelation valid truth? If it is not truth what, then, is the experience which comes in this way? Is there valid reality other than that which may be described as truth? These questions, and the major epistemological issue of which they are parts, are of most crucial importance to Christianity involving as they do other matters such as faith, prayer, spiritual disciplines, commitment. If we have brought a charge of partialization against religious education, we suggest a specification now at the point of a narrow epistemology. That there has been a concern for truth no one would care to deny. But there has also been a severe limitation of method, and the consequent unexamined rejection of the reality arrived at by revelation. Thus, its exclusive empiricism ceased to be empirical at the point where it would be expected, upon the basis of its own presuppositions, to enter into a serious and sympathetic examination of another method which, while not supplanting it, would no doubt enrich its results. Thus, religious education has not been of much service to the Christian cause at the point of supplying strength for its faith and wings for its prayers, but has rather taken more and more of the temper of critical science bent on search for knowledge of facts.

2. *Doctrine of man.* The modern view has at once exalted and debased man. There is no more frequent phrase in the writings of the religious educators than "the dignity of personality," sometimes rendered "the sanctity of personality." This is, in so far forth, a Christian doctrine. But what the modern mood has overlooked is that classic Christianity derives the dignity of personality from the fact of its creatureship under God, and sees its fruition only as man is brought to redemption by divine

grace. Religious education has seldom reminded man of his creatureship, but, on the contrary, has emphasized him as a creator; it has sought to call forth the self-expression of the natural man, and has equated redemption with growth.

Yet, as though recognizing man's dependence upon a larger reality, and not yet seeing clearly that the larger reality is God as Creator, the modern mood we are describing saw the individual as set in the social group, and dependent upon it for his vitality and growth. Professor Soares gave the statement which may be multiplied countless in the writings of Coe, Elliott, Ellwood, and the moderns: "A child comes to be religious by sharing in the common life." Classic Christianity would distinguish sharply between a mere socializing process by which the individual is adjusted to a group, and the redemption that reconciles him to God. The reconciliation with God, indeed, may set him prophetically against his group. At any rate, the source of the values by which human life is measured, is not, in the classic tradition, humanity itself. The norm of "man as the measure of his universe" is Protagorean and not Christian. Self-contained human experience may never exhaust the unsearchable riches nor be taken as the source of them.

The modern view of man has all but excluded any conception of sin, except as sin has been regarded as a maladjustment to the social group or a retardment of the normal process of growth. Many of the religious educators have revolted against the very word, sin, as being in some manner psychologically unsound. Its method, then, has been to convince those conscious of guilt that there is no such thing as sin, and consequently no necessity for a mediated forgiveness. No one would dispute that man's consciousness of wrong-doing may be morbid, and thus defeat any effort to produce the happy and normal life. But the neglect of this aspect of human expe-

rience by modern educational theory in the field of religion, has served only a superficial view of the human problem and has offered no saving reach into the vast dimensions of human powers of evil. The depth-psychology is a partial effort to overcome this difficulty, yet this new reach of psychology is still upon the basis of the presuppositions of the earlier functional or behavioristic psychologies. It takes no account, or very slight account, of the theological contribution, or even that of the Greek tragedians. And, having no appreciation of the real depth of the human problem, it has arrived at no satisfactory theory of human redemption, and now finds itself confronted by a crisis situation with inadequate equipment.

3. *Doctrine of God.* In ascribing the origin of values to the natural ground of humanity, and thus presenting man as creator rather than creature, the newer modes of thought have by the same token, almost totally neglected any view of God that comprehends Him as Creator. The reaction against the supernatural transcendence of God resulted in an exclusive emphasis upon his immanence. The classic Christian tradition, while in no sense denying the immanence, has always maintained the transcendence of the Creator God. It has declared him as objective reality, rather than subjective human idealism. It is beyond denying that this view has been subject to many abuses, and has often been translated into unintelligent, even inhuman practices. Often it has resulted in an indifference to the problems of contemporary world-life. However, it is nowhere established by historic investigation that this must be the case. On the contrary, many of the most highly transcendental theologies have been at the same time the most dynamic in social action. Only one illustration of this may be Calvinistic Puritanism with its emphasis upon the sovereignty

of God and its consequent activism in the affairs of government.

The modern mood, however, while neglecting to make any serious investigation of the matter, utterly discarded the transcendent aspects of God's reality. At its most vapid vagueness, it altogether dispensed with the use of the word, God. In other expressions it made continual reference to the god-idea, spelled with a small "g," and connoting an origin in human idealism. The democratizing influence appeared in fiction, Thomas Hardy calling Him "the President of the Immortals," as though He had been elected to his position by the human electorate. This found support in numerous serious writings in religious education and the philosophy of religion, Dr. Ames, for instance, referring to him as the Supreme member of the discussion group.

A god of naturalistic or purely human origin is regarded by the classic tradition as an idol. Man is not saved by gods of his own making, whether those deities be formed by the hands from clay and sticks, or by the mind of man from ideas and ideals. We may not resolve the issue here, but must observe that contemporary religious education has not seriously investigated its own exclusive immanentism, nor the transcendentalism it has so readily rejected. Its view of God may not be taken as a demonstration, but as an assumption, held as purely on faith as that of any theologian.

This sort of conception, while taking many forms, and having many degrees of separation from the historic Christian emphasis, is always conducive to an excess of subjectivism. Thus, religious education, while making scientific objectivity one of its cardinal doctrines, almost totally rejects religious objectivity while cultivating the subjective mood. Thus, at yet another point, it results in achieving the opposite of its original intention, and, denying the

validity of the objective reality, encourages every appearance of ill-defined idealism as equally valid with all the rest. Thus "fair-play" is spoken of as the equivalent of religion; and the reading of a lovely poem is referred to as worship. This is to neglect the fact that true Christian worship does not begin with an aesthetic emotion or ethical insight, but with a confession of creatureship, and a confession of the Creator as the Objective Reality, the Ground of Origin, and Dependence, without whom man is not only incapable of helping himself, but is nothing.

4. *Christology*. The modern conception of man tended to minimize the need for a Christology. Self-sufficient as he was, he could make a place for Jesus as one among many excellent examples of what man could accomplish, but sensed no need for Christ as Deliverer or Savior, doing for man what he could not do for himself. The name religious education, rather than Christian education may or may not have been consciously adopted with this end in view, but it well puts the emphasis where modern thought has placed it. The uniqueness of Christ as the Incarnation of God was sacrificed in favor of the historic Jesus. And the traits he shared with other teachers of religion were emphasized to the neglect of his peculiar office as the Supreme Revealer of God. The religions of mankind, including Christianity, offered a new field of interest to those who had lost the sense of the uniqueness of their own faith. And the remaining interest in Christianity was centered in those of its aspects which are the common possessions of all faiths.

There is no surprise that a mood of humanism laid great store by the manhood of Jesus. And there is no inclination to minimize the importance of the enlarged biographical interest. However, it is to be noted as another contradiction within the modern mood, that, while professing to re-discover the historic Jesus, its many

biographies were definitely stamped with the subjective patterns of their authors. The present conclusion of New Testament scholarship is that the effect did not result in a discovery of the historic Jesus, but rather in the creation of a modern Jesus formed after the patterns of contemporary thought. It offers another illustration of how the partialization of emphasis upon the general aspects of religion rather than the uniquely Christian, and upon the human, rather than divine side of Jesus, produced a distortion which tended to falsify the wholeness of Christian truth, and defeated its own end, failing in its own objectives.

5. *Sacred—Secular*. The modern mood, as expressed in religious education, has blurred the distinction between the sacred and the secular. In pronouncing all life as sacred, it lost the sense that anything is particularly so. Rebelling against a type of supernaturalism that left the world abandoned to its evil, and sincerely seeking to restore the lost dignity of life, it resulted in a naturalistic particularism in which little distinction was left between sacred and secular. The continuity of nature with the divine was the continuing theme; the discontinuity was ignored. Religion, particularly the Christian religion was no longer presented as a distinct force, having the power of social challenge precisely because it was different from the general life rather than like it. Instead of the sacred invading the secular world, the secularities overwhelmed the sanctities.

Formerly religion dominated education. Now, education was to dominate religion; and secular educational method was to become the norm for religious education. It is no lack of appreciation of the great significance of Dr. Dewey to modern thought, to recall that during the first seventy years of his life, in a long shelf of his books on science, democracy and education, not a single title appeared specifically on the subject of religion. When

The Common Faith appeared it voiced the kind of social humanitarianism which is the object of the present critique. Yet Dr. Dewey's position as the major prophet of the religious education movement is still apparent, a fact which gives further concern that the movement has gone far toward allowing itself to be shunted off from the main historic Christian stream. Its presuppositions and methodology are drawn from the disciplines of psychology and sociology, the newest branches of human learning, rather than from theology, the oldest and most characteristically Christian, and religious education, as someone commented, was simply education in a Prince Albert coat.

This preoccupation with the methods of secular learning has prevented religious education from appraising seriously the traditional methods of education, as well as the traditional content of the historic Christian curriculum. In some manner, for eighteen hundred years, the culture called Christian was actually imparted from generation to generation by symbols, creeds, catechisms, ceremonies, teachings and disputes. That there were many failures no one would deny. But that there have been fair successes in producing saintly lives and tremendously significant moral and social movements had best not be ignored. Yet the newer mood has tended to ignore the results, while turning an excessive criticism toward everything ecclesiastical. A sympathetic and objective study may show that the very spirit thus communicated was the ground for the modern scientific enterprise and the origin of the present system of universal public education.

We have made here an extreme case, and for its extremity I apologize. Yet it is

a critique that needs to be entered. Further, there will be more hope for the situation when the religious educators become more self-critical. I would not say that the movement has failed. On the contrary, under another assignment I could catalogue its values as here I have catalogued its weaknesses. The present summary is not entirely my own. It is a brief expression of a wide criticism perhaps nowhere better put than in H. Sheldon Smith's *Faith and Nurture*. There will be more hope when the criticism begins within the movement itself. Thus far its chief writers have shown defensiveness toward the neo-orthodoxy as they showed rebellion against the old, and have therefore observed no distinction between them. The ready answer is the cry of a return to fundamentalism. This may illustrate the increasing impenetrability to criticism which characterizes all orthodoxies, and which marks the untimely senility of a movement which promised much. The newer theological criticism is socially alert and scholarly informed, whereas the old fundamentalism was without either ethical or intellectual vision. There is little in common between them, and hence the new criticism may not be met by repetition of the arguments learned in the days of revolt.

The present challenge of religious education and the modern mood it expresses is two fold: it must give more serious consideration to the classic tradition as expressed in our contemporary day; and it must prove willing to undergo a more rigorous self-criticism than has thus far been demonstrated. When that takes place within the movement itself, I see no reason for a failure to complete the contribution it promised at its beginning.

A Sociological Approach to Hebrew Religion

HERBERT GORDON MAY

BY A sociological approach to the study of the religion of the Hebrews we mean something more than a study of Hebrew social institutions and related ideologies. D. Jacobson's *Social Background of the Old Testament* (Cincinnati, 1942) is an excellent treatment of the sociological aspects of Hebrew life, concerned with such subjects as marriage, the family, the individual and the group, blood and sacrifice, the levirate, and circumcision. Its interests, though more limited, are largely those also found in that great work by W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites* (3rd ed., London, 1927). In somewhat the same category we should place that significant study by J. Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture* (Copenhagen, 1926). This paper is more concerned with the study of developing religious conceptions in the light of changing social processes. A sociological approach to the study of Hebrew religion is an attempt to explain religious ideologies as emergents from social forces in conflict or to understand the religious aspects of culture in the light of contemporary social patterns. It would appreciate Hebrew religion as a reaction to concrete, but not static, social situations. More pertinent here are A. Causse, *Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse, le problème sociologique de la religion d'Israël* (Paris, 1937), Max Weber, *Das antike Judentum* (Vol. III of *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1923), and A. Lods, *Israel* (trans. by S. H. Hooke, New York, 1923). Mention should also be made of C. C. McCown's excellent volume, *The*

Genesis of the Social Gospel (New York, 1929). We are concerned here primarily with three books by Louis Wallis: *The Sociological Study of the Bible* (Chicago, 1912), *God and the Social Process* (Chicago, 1935), and *The Bible is Human* (New York, 1942).¹

Interest in the sociological study of the Bible naturally followed the development of the science of sociology. It was further encouraged by increasing emphasis on the social gospel and the interest of religious leaders in social problems. The influence of ethnology and anthropology was also a factor. The influence of positivistic philosophies also played a rôle. The sociological approach seemed consonant with natural theology. In *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, 1940, pp. 51 ff.) Albright has given a thorough description and critique of this movement. The study of the Old Testament from a sociological viewpoint has contributed much to our understanding of Hebrew religion. Critical scholars recognize its limitations, even as the limitation of the history of religions approach, the comparative religions approach, the psychological approach, or the biblical theological approach must be acknowledged. By itself, each of these gives us a partial picture. Hebrew religion was something more than a sociological phenomenon. It was more than a by-product of social processes, and it cannot be understood completely in terms of natural theology or behavioristic social psychology. Sociology may attempt to correlate the essential facts and forces of life in a single perspective (I, xxiii), but it by-passes much in human culture that is important for the understanding of religion.

¹These three volumes will be designated as I, II, and III, respectively.

In *The Prophets and Israel's Culture* (Chicago, 1934) and *Culture and Conscience* (with the present writer, Chicago, 1935), W. C. Graham was seeking for something over and above a sociological approach. Emphasizing the more broad cultural aspects of Hebrew history, he suggested that religion was the matrix and mother of culture: it was culture as a way of life distinguished by attentiveness to the total scene in which life is lived. Professor Albright's *From the Stone Age to Christianity* illustrates an approach more organic (to use his own term) than the sociological approach. With an inductive organic philosophy he would approach the problem of the relation of historical contexts to one another (p. 84). We commend his overall perspective and his endeavor to escape the subjective presuppositions of Hegelian dialectic. Despite its claim for objectivity, the sociological approach may result in the imposition of a preconceived scheme of development on history.

Human culture may be interpreted too narrowly in terms of sociological factors. Man is more than a sociological being, and his religion more than a reaction to contemporary, concrete social situations. One can no more completely comprehend religion in terms of contemporary sociological factors, than one can understand music and art in the same terms. Sociological facts may throw light upon the development of music and art, which may be influenced by sociological ideologies, discoveries in physics and mechanics, etc. Yet, over and above this, they seem to have a life of their own, and their development appears to be motivated in part by their intrinsic natures, built up through millennia of growth. Art, music, and religion become what they become not exclusively because the men who develop them find themselves in the midst of certain definite, political, economic, and social situations. There is a certain analogy between the evolution of an organism and

the development of certain definite aspects of human culture: the impetus to develop in a certain direction may come from within. From one viewpoint, Hebrew monotheism may legitimately be said to have *grown out of* the earlier Hebrew idea of God. So, also, Christianity may be described as the *flowering* of certain aspects of Old Testament religion. We may say that, as a result of the content put into the Hebrew conception of deity by Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and others, the Hebrew conception of God came to possess within itself the possibility of developing into the kind of belief we find in the universalism of Second Isaiah, or that held by the early Christians. We cannot say that it was a certain definite sociological situation, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Diaspora, which *caused* the Hebrews to become universalists. Given an entirely different social circumstance, a man of the spirit of Second Isaiah, nourished in the faith of the prophets who preceded him, might have achieved much the same universalism.

In the sociological approach there is not only the danger of minimizing the intrinsic creative character of Hebrew culture. There is a temptation to minimize the contribution of creative individuals, through emphasis on the social group. Religion is something more than the reaction of groups of people to concrete social situations. No adequate understanding of Hebrew religion is possible without reference to creative, individual personalities. It is perhaps significant that Wallis minimizes the rôles of Moses and Samuel, and gives no adequate picture of the great prophetic personalities. The creative character of Hebrew culture is integrally related to the emergence of the great prophetic figures. There is much truth in Jeremiah's belief that even before he was formed in the womb, he was set apart for the service of God (Jer. 1:5).

In the sociological approach there is also the danger of forgetting that religion has a

cosmic reference. The religion of Amos was not merely something to make him feel at home among his sheep or fellow shepherds or in Canaan. It was concerned with something more than bread and meat, or even social relationships. It concerned the cosmos. It is perhaps to be expected that many adherents to the sociological approach to Hebrew religion start with the presupposition that the gods of Canaan and the primitive Hebrew deity were local gods, concerned with a particular area and with men getting a livelihood in that area. Yet this is not a true picture. The gods of Canaan, and also Yahweh, as early as we can trace them, were cosmic deities. Try to interpret the Ras Shamra texts from a *purely* sociological approach, and you will not get very far. Religion is in part the result of man's reaction to the total universe as he conceives it, and not merely to a local situation. It comprehends past, present and future, and cannot be understood without reference to his wider cultural heritage. It comprehends, also, God, whom we believe to be a reality.

If a name is needed for a more adequate approach to the study of Hebrew religion, the present writer would suggest that it be termed an ecological or wholistic approach. The name, however, is unimportant.

In view of the manner in which his thesis rests on his interpretation of the terms *baal* and *adon*, Wallis's misinterpretation of the nature of Canaanite religion is disturbing.

²*b'l'm* occurs at Ugarit, but not in a clear text. It may refer to a single deity, as *'lhm* in the same text, and so be a plural of majesty. Possibly it is a form like *mlkm* (= Milkum, Heb. Milkom). See *Syria*, X (1929), tablet 1, line 9.

³*Bealim* in Hos. 2:15,19 is in a late passage. It occurs in Jer. 2:23, which in its present form is as late as Jehoiakim's reign. In Jer. 9:13 it belongs to Jeremiah's biographer. It appears otherwise only in passages in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, where it belongs to the Deuteronomist, and in Chronicles. It means, of course, Canaanite gods, rather than deities bearing the name of Baal.

Contrary to our abundant Canaanite data, he assumes that the Canaanites worshiped a number of local Bealim (always spelled Baalim) or "Baal-gods," and that the interests of each Baal were limited to the territory around the sanctuary where he was worshiped (II, 8; III, 30, 45). The Canaanites had no outstanding deity, and the country was divided into city-ruled groups, wherein each district revered its own local Baal "as the religious reflex of the human *bealim* (i. e., ruling caste) in the urban centers" (III, 112). Baal was thus but the projection of the human *baal*, a man of the aristocratic, upper class, who owned slaves, animals, goods, and lands (III, 29, 30). There is here no reference to the known complex pantheon of the Canaanites, in which El was father of gods and men, and Baal, son of Dagon, was king of the gods and lord of the whole earth. Baal Zebul (not Baal Zebub, III, 118) of Ekron was the same Baal who was worshiped earlier at Ugarit. He was not a mere local deity, but a cosmic god, upon whose career depended the fertility of the entire earth. He was god of clouds and thunder, and bore the name Hadad, by which he was worshiped on the Plain of Megiddo, at Damascus, and other places. He was Prince, Lord of Earth. At Ugarit it was said, "He rules over the land of El, all of it." The term Bealim cannot properly be used to refer to a plurality of deities named Baal.² It actually occurs in the biblical sources before the time of the Deuteronomic reform but once; i. e., in Hos. 11:2, where, as the parallelism shows, it is a general reference to Canaanite gods, and not to a number of deities named Baal.³

There is no evidence that any local Bealim were projections of secular *bealim*. The *bealim*, says Wallis, were a special class in Canaanite society, the aristocratic proprietors of the Amorites. They constituted collectively the upper social class, as over against the lower class, which included the

slaves (I, 44, 49, 53; II, 254). The term *baal* signified the master class, and *baalism* is to be regarded as a system of economics, in which land titles might be vacated indefinitely (II, 237; III, 28, 29, 61). There are no data which will substantiate this thesis that secular *bealim* were such a special class in Canaanite society. *Baal* means owner, proprietor, husband, citizen, etc. In Gen. 49:23 it is used with reference to archers, in 2 Sam. 1:6 to chariots, in Ex. 24:14 to a disputant in a case. It is used frequently with reference to the citizens of a city, and may refer to all its inhabitants, as at Jericho, Shechem, Gibeah, Keilah, and Jabesh Gilead (Josh. 24:1; Judg. 9:2, etc.; 20:5; 1 Sam. 23:11, 12; 2 Sam. 21:12). In the Code of the Covenant it means owner, i. e., possessor of ox, wife, etc. To judge from our Canaanite sources, it had the same meaning for the Canaanites.⁴

Wallis thinks the use of *baal* and *adon* in the E and J sources respectively is as significant as their use of Elohim and Yahweh. He speaks of the E source as the *baal* document and the J source as the *adon* source (III, 88, 94, 128). The argument is as follows: The *adonim* were rural proprietors and devotees of Yahweh as a God of justice, based on a regime of inalienable property in the soil (III, 33, 106). The Canaanite master classes were *bealim*. The *bealim* were exterminated from Ephraim by the Josephite invasion, and so the term *bealim* dropped out. The Ephraimite landed aristocracy were thus *adonim*. Ephraimite culture through the reign of Saul was apparently pure Yahwism. By the time that the Ephraimite source was composed, the term *baal* had returned. This is evidenced in Gen. 20:3; 37:19, where *baal* appears in the E source, and in the Code of the Covenant (E), where *baal* occurs 13 times and *adon* 7 times (II, 327 ff., III, 85 ff.). Judah resisted *baalism* longer than did Ephraim,

and so one finds *adon* in the J source in Genesis in the sense of master. Wallis even plays with the fantasy that Adonijah may have been so named because he opposed his father's *baalistic* tendencies (III, 128). As we shall see later, this theory of pure Yahwism in early Ephraim lacks real substantiation. Wallis seems to assume that the *baal* references in the E source must relate to near the time when the source took its present form; actually, the use of *baal* in the Code of the Covenant may go back to as early a period as the time of Joshua, when, in its earlier form, this Code was adopted at Shechem by the northern amphyctony. In any case, nothing very striking can be deduced from a 13 to 7 proportion in the use of *baal* and *adon* in the Code of the Covenant. And when we analyse the sources, we find that *baal* is used in Genesis in J twice (14:13; 49:23), and in E twice (20:3; 37:19—and the latter may be J). The only time *baal* is otherwise used in the Pentateuch in the E source is in the Code of the Covenant and in Ex. 24:14. Why, then, call E a *baal* source as over against J?

Equally difficult to understand is the suggestion that the deity Baal was but the reflection of the regime of any master class of *bealim*, especially since the latter seems nonexistent. There is nothing in Canaanite or Hebrew sources to imply that the local Bealim of the Amorites were looked upon as the divine owners and masters of Canaan (1, 73). The Canaanite Baal was not a mere glorified Effendi. In indicating the relation of Baal to the Canaanite system of ownership, Wallis says that *all contracts were legalized by oaths in the name of Baal* (II, 10; cf. III, 30. The italics are not mine). We possess no Canaanite contracts to substantiate this, and it is clear that the Canaanites took oath by many different deities in their pantheon (cf. Jer. 12:16; Amos 8:13, 14; Zeph. 1:5).

The true historian will recognize that

⁴Cf. Z. S. Harris, *Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936), glossary, *ad. loc.*

Canaan, from the earliest times to the present, has been in contact with the desert. The black tent of the nomad has long dotted Canaan's landscape. The conflict between the cultures of the Desert and the Sown may be as ancient as the late Mesolithic and the Neolithic periods, when agriculture was invented and men began to live in cities. This conflict did not originate when the Hebrews entered Canaan. The distinctive grouping and ideals of the nomad doubtless persisted even among the city dwellers, as they clung to traditions of their origin. The legends concerning the wandering Aramean Abraham and traditions about Isaac probably circulated in Canaan among the Canaanites before the Hebrews adopted and adapted them. The development of the Hebrew nation would tend to cause an increasing disintegration of nomadic elements in the culture of the inhabitants of Canaan, when compared with the earlier period. The Hebrews reacted by idealizing in tradition the story of their origins. Thus we get the story of the neat division of the land among twelve tribes at the time of Joshua. The nomadic past toward which the prophets pointed was in many respects more ideal than real (*Jer. 2:1 ff.*), and tribal organization became the ideal for the golden age (*cf. Ezek. 47:13 ff.*). Yet it is interesting that tradition did not point to the Hebrews as *native* to the desert. At the most, it was a period of forty years wandering in the desert.

This must be kept in mind in evaluating the interpretation of primitive Yahwism and the origin of the Hebrews as described by Wallis. The Hebrews, he says, came from the Arabian desert (*I, 3, 94; III, 21, 46 ff.*). They lived in Transjordan a long time, and then moved across in waves into the Israelite highlands south of the plain of Esdraelon. They belonged to the house of Joseph. The first elements to move over

later became known as Simeon and Levi, and were destroyed near Shechem. Machir, the later clan-group moving over, became known as Manasseh, a part of which gave rise to Ephraim. Ephraim, spreading south, gave rise to Benjamin and, much later, to Judah (*II, 36 ff., 66, 67; III, 46, 47*). This reconstruction ignores the tradition of early conquests north of Esdraelon. We do not know the direction from which the Habiru of the Amarna age came into Canaan and Transjordan. Perhaps we should give more credence to the tradition that some of the "tribes" were born in north Mesopotamia, near Paddan Aram, and to the tradition of the Aramean origin of the Hebrews.

Since Wallis maintains that the Hebrew nation developed at the point of contact between Amorite society and tribes from the wilderness of Arabia (*II, 58*), his conception of primitive Yahwism is an important part of his thesis. Yahweh was primatively identified with obscure hill clans from the desert, and was a local god with his seat at Mt. Sinai (*I, 129; III, 57*). With this desert deity was associated the desert morality of the sort found in Arabia today (*I, 89; II, 11*). As did all desert nomads, the Hebrews in their primitive origins had the *mishpat* idea that land, water, etc. were communal, and not commercial, and they expressed this through the cult of Yahweh, which they had taken over by friendly contact with another social group in the desert. Yahwism thus stood for the principle of non-saliability of the land. This communal desert *mishpat* principle reappeared in Canaan as the *mishpat* principle that every piece of land held by Israel was the inalienable possession of the family that owned the soil (*II, 10, 11, 58, 59; III, 32*).

Albright has pointed out the dangers in identifying the nomadic culture of the second millennium B. C. with that of the modern camel-riding Arabs.⁵ The nomadic con-

⁵*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 96 ff.

ception of deity in the ancient day probably more closely approximated that of the settled territories than is usually thought. In any case, the conflict between the ideas of inalienable family property and unlimited saleability of the land was doubtless as ancient as the development of agriculture in the Mesolithic period. It was the increasing commercialization which accompanied the United Monarchy, so effectively described by Morgenstern,⁶ which sharpened the issue for the Hebrews. It seems probable that Yahweh at his earliest appearance at the time of Moses, was a cosmic deity, a storm and creator god. As a result of the activity of Moses, he became the deity of a group of tribes, and was worshiped in a henotheistic rather than polytheistic system. The Hebrews who entered Canaan in the Amarna period to be united by Joshua at Schechem may not have entered under the aegis of Yahweh, if the exodus from Egypt did not occur until the 13th century. The early Hebrew settlers in Ephraim may not have been Yahwists at all.

These and other considerations weigh against any theory of the purity of primitive Ephraimite Yahwism. Wallis thinks that in Ephraim the baalistic culture was wiped out by the invading Hebrews, although it remained outside Ephraim's borders. Syncretism took place in the latter time between Yahweh and Baal, but we cannot, he says, project the Canaanite cults into the Joseph enclave in the period of the Judges. The Canaanite ruling classes were annihilated, and Yahweh *mishpat* established, against the sale and exchange of land (I, 112; III, 84 ff.). The Deuteronomist is wrong in Judges in assuming a re-

current putting away of Amorite gods (I, 105). Saul consolidated the Josephite *adonim* of the hills of Ephraim, and during the time of Saul Ephraim continued apart from the Amorite Bealim (I, 117; III, 93). David incorporated the baalistic elements within the Hebrew kingdom, at the time when the Amorite cities entered that kingdom, and only then did Yahwism take on some of the attributes of baalism. Social control passed from country to city (II, 134 ff.). When, at the time of Jeroboam I, Israel revolted, it was a rebellion of the rural peasantry against the corrupt oriental city of Jerusalem, strengthened by hatred of walled cities, and the rule of Jeroboam I was rural, the ideals of Ephraim in this period being non commercialistic (II, 159, 160; III, 146).

This reconstruction does not take into sufficient consideration the fact that the Ephraimite document does not use the term Yahweh until the time of Moses, and that the Ephraimite conquest may have preceded the time of Moses. It limits that conquest too narrowly to the Ephraimite hills. Syncretism in the period of the Judges is indicated in the alternative name of Gideon, Jerubbaal, and by the sanctuary of Baal at Ophrah (Judg. 6). It is indicated at the time of Saul in the name of Saul's son, Ishbaal, and at the time of Jeroboam I by the golden calves at Dan and Bethel.⁷ The archaeological data make it impossible to consider the reign of Jeroboam I rural and non-commercialistic. Jeroboam I rebuilt and enlarged the city of Megiddo, increasing its stable capacity, perhaps to continue Solomon's business in horses and chariots.⁸

Waterman's theory that Judah was a later name for a new fusion of Edomite clans⁹ should be compared with the suggestion of Wallis that it was David who consolidated the peasant aristocracy of the south under the name of Judah, and so formed the "tribe" out of diverse and

⁶Hebrew Union College Annual, XV (1940), 59 ff.

⁷Cf. T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (New York, 1936), 134 ff.

⁸Stratum IV B is Solomonic. See Albright, *AASOR*, 1943, 2ff.

⁹AJSL, LV (1938), 25 ff.

alien clans in the south (II, 39 ff., 125 ff.; III, 102 ff.). We do violence to our historical data, however, when we excise Judah from the exodus narrative and from the first chapter of Judges. Contrary to Wallis, Othniel, in Judges I, is more than an abstraction or an invented judge (III, 76). The excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim (Kirjath Sepher), showing the destruction of the Canaanite city in the second half of the 13th century, may be taken as corroboration of the traditions of the conquests of Othniel. Lachish, as we know from the excavations, fell about the same time. The references to these conquests in Judges I are not fiction. It is not even improbable that the story of the capture of Jerusalem by the Judeans in Judges I might have been confirmed by the excavations, had the remains on Ophel been less disturbed by later occupation.

The sociological approach of Wallis is based too exclusively on literary critical analysis, without adequate check from available non-biblical sources. To all intents and purposes, Wallis ignores the archaeological data. There might have been some excuse for this in a volume published in 1912, but none for a volume published in 1935 or 1942. How one can pretend to discuss pre-Hebrew Canaan with no reference to the abundant information provided by archaeological research is beyond the imagination of the present writer. Yet, in his last volume, Wallis does this, discussing stone age man with no allusion to the discoveries of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, or Neolithic man in Palestine. On p. 22 an inadequate bibliographical footnote is added as an afterthought. There is no reference to the development of agriculture in the Mesolithic period, and he has objects of metal in the strata lying above Palaeolithic deposits (III, 21 ff.), giving the impres-

sion that the age of metals follow the Palaeolithic Age. There is a section on the copper mines of the Arabah and the Megiddo stables, but it is not integrated into the discussion, being added to the original manuscript. Wallis interprets the exodus period without reference to chronology or the pertinent archaeological data. I found but one allusion to the Amarna letters, and that in a casual reference in an Appendix, where their significance is completely missed (III, 278). The city of Bethel is described as the most important of many small villages and as being unfortified (II, 69). The excavations disclose that the city wall which was destroyed ca. 1500 B. C. was one of the best of the period.¹⁰ In describing Gibeah as "an open, undefended country village" Wallis ignores the large fortress of Saul discovered in the excavations at Tell el-Ful (II, 132). Kadesh Barnea is not to be identified with Ain Quadeis (II, 63), but with Ain Qudeirat.¹¹ The father of Jezebel was not the king of Sidon (III, 157), but the king of Tyre, the text using the term Sidonians as a synonym for Phoenicians. The Merenptah Stele reference to Israel does not belong to pre-Hebrew Canaan (II, 68).

Wallis affirms that in constructing the figure of Moses, the Hebrews used as prototype "the sanguinary prophetic figure of the actual, historic, Ephraimite *nabi* (prophet) Elijah, who, in the ritual practice means more to the Jewish tradition than Moses himself" (III, 263), and that if there was some "inconspicuous person" behind the Moses tradition, we can never recover him (III, 264). It is difficult for us to see wherein Elijah, who was not a lawgiver, served as the prototype for Moses, and the Moses tradition in its general outlines is certainly older than the time of Elijah. Aaron, thinks Wallis, is "an evanescent figure," perhaps the ark personified: the priests who had charge of the ark would be called "sons of the ark," and so Aaron may be derived

¹⁰See *BASOR*, No. 56.

¹¹See *AASOR*, XV, 118 ff.

from Hebrew *aron* (= ark). This etymology is as impossible and antiquated as his derivation of Israel from Ish-Rahel, "Man of Rachel" (II, 219; III, 42,263). The tradition of enslavement in Egypt is interpreted as a reflection of the historic fact that before the conquest of Canaan the Egyptians ruled over Canaan (III, 262), and the sale of Joseph into slavery is said to reflect, among other things, the historical servitude of Israel to Judah in the United Monarchy (III, 138). But archaeological data make the enslavement in Egypt more than a probability, and in the Joseph story Joseph is sold by all his brothers, and the author may intend to picture Judah in a favorable light. We may doubt that the national "planned economy" of Joseph in Egypt was considered as the ideal program of social justice for Canaan (II, 61). We seem to recall that Joseph enslaved the Egyptians, and squeezed them out of their land and herds, and then taxed them 20% of what they raised on the land. Wallis argues that the fact that Shishak gave succor to Jeroboam I and sacked Jerusalem helps us understand how the narrative picks out Egypt as the scene of this "planned economy." (II, 205). Yet the Israelites probably never thanked Shishak for invading Israel at the same time he invaded Judah, and burning some of Israel's cities, as at Megiddo. It is also fantastic to believe that the incident of the flight of Jeroboam I to Egypt and his return furnished part of the raw material for the tradition of the entrance of Joseph into Egypt and the return from Egypt, for the tradition doubtless antedated Jeroboam I. The story of the crossing of the Red Sea is taken as an adaptation of the tradition of the overthrow of the chariots and army of Sisera in the River Kishon in Judges 5 (II, 60, 63; III, 262). Yet there was no separation of the waters of the Kishon, and there is no close analogy, while the studies of Eissfeldt, Jarvis, and others have shown a strong possibility of a historical basis for

this incident. In complete disregard of the archaeological data, to judge from II, 68, the destruction of Jericho is placed after the reign of Merenptah. Wallis gives too little credence to the Hebrew legends. To him Abraham is a mythical patriarch (II, 101), but we are just beginning to appreciate the manner in which the legends of the patriarchal period may preserve historical reminiscences.

Many other details of the presentation by Wallis deserve attention. Most careful historians would disagree with his use of the term *mishpat*. We may wonder why he insists on using Sh'lomoh, saying that it is rendered inaccurately as Solomon, and yet he uses Samuel instead of Sh'muel, Judah instead of Yehudah, etc., etc., etc. We must conclude, however, with a brief comment on his interpretation of the chronology of the J and E sources. The E source is dated to the middle of the eighth century B. C., and the J source to the exile (III, 178-182, 245). This is consonant with the theory of the priority of Ephraimite Yahwism. The more primitive (?) religious conceptions in J are explained by the ideological differences between Judah and Israel, some of which can be noted in the prophets. The Ephraimite prophets Hosea and Jeremiah (sic!) "hear" the word of Yahweh, and, as in the E source, Yahweh does not appear in personal guise. By contrast, the Judean prophets, such as Amos and Isaiah, "see" Yahweh, even as in the J source Yahweh appears in person or is represented by angels. These conclusions are derived by considering only part of the evidence, for the Judean prophets Micah, Zephaniah, etc. do not see Yahweh in person, and an angel does appear in E in the incident at Penuel. Since Anathoth belonged to the southern kingdom, it is difficult to see how Jeremiah can be classed as an Ephraimite prophet. Wallis maintains that the J source shows the influence of the Deuteronomic theory of a single sanctuary,

but the fact that in J the patriarchs are pictured building altars in Canaan but not offering sacrifice is best explained as the result of a "prophetic" attitude toward sacrifice,¹² whereas in E there is obviously more interest in ritual. Although the hand of D may not be entirely absent from the present formulation of the JE documents, the diction of both J and E is that of classical Hebrew narrative, and quite unlike that of the sixth or fifth century B. C. J and E doubtless reflect recensions of a single narrative, which took form during the

United Monarchy, and was in process of formation perhaps even earlier.

Although this discussion has shown fundamental disagreement with the positions taken by Wallis, this is not to say that his work does not have merit. The skilled historian will find it provocative, as the author displays a fertile imagination which may shed unexpected light. It should be used by those who have the training which will make it possible to sift and sort the data. For the more advanced students, used critically, these volumes by Wallis may serve as reference books. It is unfortunate that he ignores so completely the contributions of contemporary scholars, and the main thesis is subject to grave doubts.

¹²See R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), 172-173.

Thirty-six Opinions on Pre-Seminary Studies

J. PAUL WILLIAMS

Reprints of an article from the *Journal* for August, 1943, entitled "Should Prospective Ministers Major in Religion as Undergraduates?" were sent to about a hundred well-known religious leaders, including the presidents of the better-known theological schools. Letters giving reactions to the article were received from sixteen presidents or deans of theological seminaries, nine theological professors, and eleven denominational executives (bishops, board secretaries, a Student Christian Movement executive, an editor). Twenty-two of this group favor the proposal to include a major in religion among the studies recommended for pre-seminary students, nine oppose it, and five are uncertain.

The seminary presidents and deans have a large majority in favor of the idea; the letters of ten of them are judged by me to indicate that they would vote "Yes" on the proposal; three would vote "No"; three appear to be "Uncertain."

The seminary professors are evenly divided. Four would vote "Yes" and the same number "No"; one seems to be "Uncertain."

The denominational executives are heavily in favor: eight "Yes"; two "No"; one "Uncertain."

Among the nine persons (a fourth of the total group) who oppose the idea, the argument most frequently advanced is that "the minister simply *must* have a broad cultural base. If he begins his specialization in religion as an undergraduate he will be top-heavy with religion and lack essential foundation in the social sciences."

This argument is of course true as things stand in the theological schools today. But the proposal is that the existing situation be changed in such a manner that the theo-

logical student can continue his "non-religious" studies during seminary years. Certainly the minister needs a broad cultural base; he needs a far better one than most of us have. But the way to get it is not to cram all his "culture" into his undergraduate years and all his serious study of religion into his more mature seminary years. That is an excellent scheme for bringing men to the conviction that "culture" and religion belong in two different intellectual compartments. Ministers need to bring all the maturity and experience they have to bear on their study of the problems of our complex and sick society, and on the study of how religion can contribute to the solution of these problems. If students were to begin their religious studies earlier and to continue their cultural studies longer, there would be a decided increase in maturity in both fields.

Most seminaries are already in a position to offer advanced "cultural" courses. Every seminary has on its staff experts in literature, philosophy, and history. The "cultural" effect on the seminary professor who had to teach courses not strictly in his area of specialization but in the field of his general competence, would be very salutary and would tend to force him to find ways to integrate religion with "non-religious" concerns. Furthermore, many of the seminaries are located on or near the campuses of great universities from which could be drawn a wealth of experts. One seminary president writes, "Why should the seminary be obliged to make up inadequacies in the social sciences? It has not the professional staff for such departments." Yet on that president's own faculty are a psychologist, a sociologist, and a teacher of social work.

I notice in the letters a tendency to imply that what a minister misses of liberal education as an undergraduate he can never recover. This implication fails to recognize that the range of knowledge is so vast today that no person can get more than an introduction to it in his undergraduate years, that since society is changing so rapidly the social science he studies today has but an off-chance of being relevant tomorrow, that the psychologists have made startling discoveries about the capacities of adults to learn, and that the minister, if he is going to be a creative agent in the formation of the coming American culture, must never leave off pursuing his liberal education. The seminaries need to show him how to continue his study effectively by keeping alive his interest in liberal education, and by showing him how to integrate his study of religion with his study of the general culture.

Another objection to an undergraduate major in religion for pre-theological students is that it is undesirable to "burn over the seminary material at the undergraduate level." Is the subject matter of religion so meager that there is not enough material for undergraduate and graduate study? There is a move now to extend the seminary course to four years. If this is done, will the first year of seminary study "burn over" the ground for the last three? The question of the proper line of division between graduate and undergraduate religious study no doubt poses a problem; yet surely the seminary and college teachers can solve it, if they are given opportunities for conference. I suggest that the assertion that the ground will be "burned over" or that the studies of the seminary will be "anticipated" really means that the teaching in the first year of the seminary is now undergraduate in character. Seminaries have become so accustomed to having to begin at scratch with their students that some seminary teachers think of this as the ideal

situation. If pre-theological students were to major in religion, there is no good reason why seminaries could not do in the first seminary year what they now do in the second. If students come to the seminary without the undergraduate courses in religion, let them take the undergraduate courses, either at the seminary or in a college.

One seminary president states the argument against the undergraduate major as follows. "In all too many cases the work in religion which students had in college has not been particularly helpful as preparation for their seminary training. In some cases it is more or less of a hindrance. We know of certain colleges which have a strong and appealing department of religion. We know the professors and wish to the point of prayer that we could have more students come to us from those particular colleges; but only a few do come and we have to take our students from a great variety of inadequate sources. Much of their previous training has to be undone."

As I understand it, this was the argument which brought the American Association of Theological Schools to its present position regarding pre-seminary studies. And no doubt there is much truth in it. The seminaries are filled with students from conservative, evangelistic backgrounds; relatively few students come from schools which have a "strong and appealing department of religion."

One of the reasons why the theological seminaries are not getting as many students as they would like from the "best" colleges is that the seminaries themselves have adopted a policy which discourages the college from establishing "strong and appealing" departments of religion. No department can be strong unless students will elect its courses—advanced as well as elementary. The natural clientele of the department of religion is shunted away from religion into other courses by the advice

which is voiced so commonly today and which the seminaries have formulated in their "Statement on Pre-Seminary Studies." As a result, up and down the country the departments of religion are reduced to one man who, in addition to teaching all the courses in religion, is commonly expected to act as college chaplain and to advise the student religious organizations. He can hardly compete for student interest with a half dozen men in economics, or political science, or biology. Every department is eager to get the ablest students into its field. The position of religion on the campus is low. The notion gets abroad among faculty and students that religion is not a particularly important aspect of American culture, nor an essential ingredient of a liberal education. One significant effect of enlarged departments of religion would be

the lifting of the level of religious experience and knowledge throughout the undergraduate campus. Another would be that the seminaries would get more and better candidates from the "best" schools.

I wonder if it is not true that the majority of the theological students today come from the colleges where religion is given as much importance as any other discipline. Are not the colleges where this situation prevails generally small schools where one-man departments are the rule? If the departments of religion in the so-called better colleges were strengthened, the interest in the ministry on the part of the students of these colleges would be bound to be quickened. I see no method of strengthening these departments without encouraging pre-theological students to major in them.

EDITORIAL

Religious Dynamics

It is startling to see how the crisis of modern life is driving us back to the words with which Jesus began his mission in Galilee approximately 1900 years ago: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." According to this gospel pattern, there are three stages in the process of redemption: (1) the recognition of the need of repentance, an awareness of crisis or judgment; (2) the act of repentance itself; and (3) believing in the gospel; i. e., actually putting one's faith—confidently and hopefully—in the reign of God.

Let us begin by examining the first of these three stages: "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." The New Testament word used here for "time" is *kairos* which carries with it the meaning of "change" whereas the other Greek word for time, *kronos*, signifies "duration." Thus *kairos* may mean crisis, a moment when history comes to a head! Emil Brunner puts the idea in these words: "Lightning out of eternity flashes into time, and the place where it strikes is called the Moment."¹ *Kairos* also connotes judgment, in connection with which the writer is reminded of the words of Walter Horton: "a candid reading of modern history makes us soberly conscious of the perpetual imminence of those awful Days of Reckoning known as *War* and *Revolution*. Let any nation be denied its fair share of the world's raw materials, and sooner or later its neigh-

bors must yield up forcibly, with blood and tears, what they were unwilling to give out of their surplus. Let any class in society claim for itself privileges that are denied to others, and sooner or later it will wreck the social order, lose its leadership in some great crisis, and become subject to those it has oppressed until the next revolution causes another redistribution of privileges . . ."²

Men who are experiencing the catastrophic upheaval of the present day and who have the slightest capacity for reflection ought to be in a mood for repentance. This has at least been true of men in other periods of crisis, according to the argument of the Harvard sociologist, Pitirim A. Sorokin, in his recent book, *Man and Society in Calamity*.³

Sorokin does not argue that all men are affected by calamity in the same way. Some men become saints under the impact of adversity, some reject moral responsibility and become sinners, while an in-between group fluctuates between one extreme and the other depending upon the extent to which its members have achieved an integration of values. Nevertheless, the great periods of ethical and religious revival have been eras of profound crisis. Indeed, Sorokin shows that "virtually all the great world religions (Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Taoism, Jainism, and the more spiritualized cults of ancient Egypt) arose and flourished under precisely the conditions afforded by such social crises."⁴ Periods of disturbance produce atheism and irresponsibility on the one hand, but on the other they create a pronounced exaltation on the part of another element in the

¹Quoted by Robert E. Fitch, "Crisis and Continuity in History," *Review of Religion*, March, 1944 (Vol. VIII, Number 3), p. 248.

²God, p. 44.

³Dutton, 1942.

⁴Ibid., p. 200.

population. As Dr. Sorokin states, referring to the years 1918-22 which marked the most destructive phase of the Soviet Revolution and followed hard upon the First World War, "Many a professor who never before preached in the church, now began to do so. Former eminent Marxians and professors of political economy, like Sergius Bulgakoff, not only were converted to Christianity but became priests, monks, or ascetics. If the churches were less crowded than before the revolution, those who attended them were true believers, prepared to suffer martyrdom for their faith (as, indeed, many of them did)."⁵

The life of Dostoevsky offers a vivid example of Sorokin's theory of "man in calamity." Together with others Dostoevsky was arrested on April 23, 1849 on a charge of political conspiracy. He was tried, found guilty, and condemned to be shot. Nicholas I permitted all of the gruesome preparations for the execution to be carried out in detail up to the last possible moment when he had a courier dash up with a commutation of the death sentence to Siberian imprisonment. The description of an execution given by Dostoevsky in *The Idiot* is thought to be essentially autobiographical:

There were crowds of people, there was noise and shouting; ten thousand faces, ten thousand eyes—all that he has had to bear, and, worst of all, the thought, "They are ten thousand, but not one of them is being executed, and I am to be executed." There is a ladder to the scaffold. Suddenly at the foot of the ladder he began to cry . . . The priest never left him for a moment . . . At last he began going up the ladder; his legs were tied together so that he could only move with tiny steps . . . At the foot of the ladder he was very pale, and when he was at the top and standing on the scaffold, he became as white as paper, as white as writing paper. His legs must have grown weak and wooden, and I expect he felt sick—as though something were choking him and that made a sort of tickling

in his throat. I think that if one is faced by inevitable destruction—if a house is falling upon you, for instance—one must feel a great longing to sit down, close one's eyes and wait, come what may . . . It's strange that people rarely faint at these last moments. On the contrary, the brain is extraordinarily lively and must be working at a tremendous rate—at a tremendous rate, like a machine at full speed. I fancy that there is a continual throbbing of ideas of all sorts, always unfinished and perhaps absurd too, quite irrelevant ideas: "That man is looking at me. He has a wart on his forehead. One of the executioner's buttons is rusty," . . . and yet all the while one knows and remembers everything. There is one point which can never be forgotten, and one can't faint, and everything moves and turns about it, about that point. And only think that it must be like that up to the last quarter of a second, when his head lies on the block and he waits and . . . *knows*, and suddenly hears above him the clang of the iron! He must hear that! If I were lying there, I should listen on purpose and hear. It may last only the tenth part of a second, but one would be sure to hear it. And only fancy, it's still disputed whether, when the head is cut off, it knows for a second after that it has been cut off! What an idea! And what if it knows it for five seconds!

This cruel experience left its marks upon Dostoevsky for the rest of his life. It aggravated the tendency toward epilepsy from which Dostoevsky already suffered. According to a recent book on *The Soul of Russia*,⁶ it produced a "psychic trauma from which he never recovered."

Spiritually, this experience and the hardships of imprisonment and exile which followed, had great importance for the development of Dostoevsky. Calamity in this case produced a saint rather than a sinner. There has been a tendency among admirers of Dostoevsky to deny the justice of the harsh punishment meted out by Nicholas I. The members of the Petrashevski Circle to which Dostoevsky belonged has been passed off as well-meaning "idealists" whose activities would never have had any seriously adverse effects upon the stability of the Russian imperial government. That, however, was not the view of the Russian gov-

⁵Ibid, p. 200.

⁶Helen Iswolsky, p. 137.

ernment, nor does it, according to E. J. Simmons⁷ seem to be a true interpretation of the purpose of the Petrashevski group or at least of the more radical, inner Durov circle to which Dostoevsky belonged. According to Simmons, "Dostoevsky was engaged in a real political conspiracy." Such an interpretation renders more intelligible the religious dynamics which seem to have worked upon the inner life of Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky seems to have accepted his punishment as deserved. At any rate, the "calamity" of his near-execution and Siberian imprisonment had a marked effect upon his spiritual development.

We sometimes forget that there is a third element in the New Testament analysis: "believe the gospel." There is a note of hopefulness in these words which is not always sufficiently stressed. "Believe this good news," Goodspeed translates. Walter Lowrie contrasts the message of Jesus with that of John the Baptist at this point, remarking that Jesus' "message was formally and substantially the same as John's, except for the fact that he proclaimed it as Gospel, i. e., good tidings, and laid stress upon the requirement of faith . . .".⁸

This is a note that it is especially important to emphasize today when people in general and young people in particular need to have grounds for hope with regard to the future. It is much easier these days to believe in the

validity of Jesus' teaching about love than it is to share his faith and hope. Nevertheless, these are definitely a part of the message of Jesus and they are essential ingredients of the Christian dynamic. Jesus taught about a judgment and the necessity of repentance, but he also proclaimed the reign of God which is the good news in which the Christian may place a confident hope.

We need to be able to see the creative possibilities of moments of crisis. It helps to know that a period of crisis is not necessarily a blank wall, but that it may have in it a door opening onto a sunlit world of infinite possibilities. This is suggested by Whitehead's reference to "the transition from God the enemy to God the companion." Francis Thompson states the same thing poetically:

Halts by me that footfall:
Is my gloom, after all,
Shade of His hand, outstretched
caressingly?
"Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,
I am He Whom thou seekest!
Thou dravest love from thee, who
dravest Me."

In our interpretation of religion and life, then, let us be aware of the fact of judgment and the necessity of repentance, but let us not forget the importance of hope in giving religious living its dynamic.

C. E. P.

⁷Dostoevsky, *The Making of a Novelist*, p. 67.

⁸The Short Story of Jesus, p. 21.

A Request from the Editorial Office

Do you have a copy of Volume I, Part I of the *Journal* that you will part with for the good of the cause? We are in touch with libraries which will order a complete set of volumes I-XI, provided we are able to obtain copies of this number. Send your copy to the editor.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A Tribute to Dr. Ismar J. Peritz

To the Editor:

In the recent past I have had occasion to exchange letters with one of the charter members of NABI, Mrs. Olive Dutcher Doggett. In one of her letters she made some statements about the origins of NABI which threw such a significant light on our history that I think her statements ought to be printed in our Journal, both for the enlightenment of our members and for the sake of historical record.

In acknowledging a letter in which I had given her information about Professor Peritz's present address, she wrote as follows about the starting of our organization:

"The project originated in Professor Peritz's mind, and Raymond Knox and Professor Wood of Smith College and I were asked to meet with him after the Bib. Lit. session to discuss possibilities. The outcome was that Professor Wood and I were detailed to get up a program for a session the next Christmas season to convene

wherever Bib. Lit. did, and to send invitations to people who might be interested to attend. We asked Genung of Amherst to join us (you see we were all near each other, since I was then teaching at Mt. Holyoke), and I remember writing Miss Kendrick to give a paper. At the first regular and launching session, Professor Kent, who had come in reply to an invitation, was elected president. For quite some years thereafter I would see Prof. Peritz, and we had friendly fellowship outside as well as inside meetings. That was how I became really acquainted with him, and I was always impressed with a kind of modesty of manner united with much solid information and a scholar's mental integrity."

I personally rejoice in Mrs. Doggett's tribute to Professor Peritz. We rejoice that he is still with us. At our New York meeting last December he took part in the discussions with as much vigor and enthusiasm and helpfulness as ever.

Heartily yours,
ELMER W. K. MOULD

Dr. Chave replies to Dr. Filson and Dr. Gibson

The position taken by Dr. Filson is well met by a well-known religious educator, Dr. W. C. Bower, in his books, "The Living Bible," and "Christ and Christian Education." Dr. Filson seems to depart from the role as a Biblical scholar using critical historical methods when he says that it is necessary to use "a theological position" in interpreting the Bible. He speaks continually of the Bible as if it had one message, "a Christian message," and as if only one idea of God was present and center of it all. For the sake of cooperative thinking it might be better to specify definite ways in which parts of the Bible could be used,

and to indicate ways in which it might be misused. Religious educators feel the need of help on specific uses of the Bible with different age groups and for particular human needs.

Dr. Gibson confesses that he was guilty of more oratory than fair criticism, and that he caricatured religious education rather than giving a just appraisal of its varied forms and trends. It is unfortunate also that he leaves the impression that religious educators are prone to "partialization," "falsifying the wholeness of Christian truth." The attempt to disparage religious educators in one sentence and to give con-

descending praise in another seems to reveal more prejudice than insight into the issues that are being discussed. Readers who may wish to see a keen critical analysis of Shelton Smith's book "Faith and Nurture," which Dr. Gibson admits using freely, will find it in The International Journal of Religious Education, December 1941. They will also find a clear statement of the conflict between a theological and educational approach to religion in "Can Religious Education be Christian?" by H. S. Elliott.

Before men and women of different backgrounds and training in fields of religion can hope to work together profitably it would seem that we must be ready to do either, or both, of these two things:

- 1) confine discussion to a few specific problems where objectivity is at a maximum.
- 2) be ready to critically examine basic assumptions regarding such matters as revelation, God and Reality, uniqueness of Jesus Christ, Biblical truth, supernaturalism, naturalism, humanism, and other forms of theological expression.

Mutual understanding and respect are essential to fruitful collaboration. Diversity of beliefs may be inevitable, but friendly cooperative action may reflect Christian attitudes. Whatever its faults religious education believes in possibilities of Christian growth—in all persons.

Sincerely,
ERNEST J. CHAVE

Herbert G. May replies to Louis Wallis

To the Editor:

You and other members of the NABI have doubtless received copies of the widely circulated tract by Louis Wallis, "*Professor H. G. May, of Oberlin, Raises the Underlying Religious Issue of Today.*" This is his criticism of my article, based on a manuscript which I read at the Chicago meeting of the Mid-West Branch of the NABI, and which I sent to him. Naturally, I was considerably surprised at the form which his reply took, in advance of the publication of this article. It ignores certain changes which I informed him might be made in the article before publication. I am, naturally, interested only in discovering the truth, and this article is not at all, as Mr. Wallis seems to take it, an "attack."

I am entirely willing to leave to the read-

er the question as to whether or not Louis Wallis has correctly interpreted my criticism of his work. He has certainly drawn unwarranted conclusions regarding my own attitude toward the relation of religion and social ethics. I would particularly call attention to his misinterpretation of my criticism in the first paragraph of page 14 of his tract, and note that a typographical error lies behind his comment on page 23.

There is no desire on my part to enter into a public debate with Mr. Wallis. I trust that the readers of Mr. Wallis' tract have waited until the appearance of this article, when they might have the complete criticism before them, before drawing too many conclusions.

Sincerely yours,
H. G. MAY

BOOK REVIEWS

Christianity Today

The Vitality of the Christian Tradition.
Edited by GEORGE F. THOMAS. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. xi + 358 pages. \$3.00.

This is an admirable presentation by a group of Christian scholars, of the leading historical factors in the Christian tradition, and some of the outstanding issues of the present cultural crisis, which has endangered the whole future of this great tradition, and thereby endangered the whole world.

The Old and New Testaments, early Christianity, medieval Christianity, classical and liberal Protestantism, are taken up chronologically, always with reference to the relation between each historical phase and the cultural environment which it helped to remold, while being itself remolded in the process. A particularly interesting study of such interaction is to be found in President Lynn White's sketch of medieval Christianity, where much is made of the monastic attempt to escape from the evils of feudalism and nascent capitalism by fleeing from the world, which did not prevent feudalism and capitalism from penetrating the cloisters nevertheless: "flight from the world had failed because the refugees did not understand the complexity of the movements from which they were trying to escape" (p. 103).

Special mention should be made of the chapter by Douglas Steere on "The Devotional Literature of Christianity," where the "books of power" which Christianity has produced in all its post-Biblical history are selected and appraised as sources of insight and inspiration available to modern undergraduates. Professor Steere's successful experiment in the use of this material

in a course at Haverford should be followed up by other teachers. His bibliography and his notes on teaching real high religion by this method are most suggestive.

Professor Steere's chapter, exactly midway in the thirteen, forms the watershed between the historical and contemporary parts of the book. It is followed by chapters in which the relation of the Christian tradition to modern culture (especially literature) modern philosophy, physical science, psychology, ethics and politics are successively reviewed. The concluding chapter on "Christianity and Democracy," by the editor, is a careful examination of the thesis "that religion and democracy in our day should make common cause against totalitarianism."

Altogether, it is a valuable book for college teachers of religion to put upon their reserve shelf, for it advances from the attitude of detached historical survey to that of philosophical evaluation and cultural reconstruction.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON
Oberlin College

Christianity and the Contemporary Scene.
Edited by RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER and HENRY H. SHIRES. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Company, 1943. vii+231 pages. \$3.00.

This is a series of fifteen essays in recognition of the fiftieth anniversary of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California. Its contributors are faculty members of that school and other near-by institutions: Randolph C. Miller, George Morrel, James Muilenburg, Pierson Parker, Henry H. Shires, Bishop W. Bertrand Stevens, Bishop Edward L. Parsons,

John C. Bennett, Monroe E. Deutsch, Everett Bosshard, C. Rankin Barnes, and Ethel M. Springer. The topics covered relate to recent trends in American and Continental theology; the origin of religion; the Church; the value of Jesus and Old Testament theology for today; the relation of Christian ethics to a world at war; the interpretation of history in the light of Christian thought; techniques in pastoral care; Christian education.

The general character of these essays can be described as centered in social religion, a theistic framework, a Church-consciousness, a modern constructive approach to the Scriptures, and a faith in the Jewish-Christian prophetic interpretation of life. The writers are men and women who are looking at the problems of life with a religious vision which is clear, realistic, and reverent. They represent a school of thought which swings neither to the left of Naturalistic Humanism nor to the right of Neo-supernaturalism; yet one cannot but realize that the people who write here have been affected or "corrected" by these polar movements, and that their theistic thought has been tempered by their contact with the breadth and depth of other schools of religious thought. Their minds have been synthetic.

A few quotations here and there will give a general "feel" of some of the writers: "Theologians must take the Bible more seriously. There is a biblical 'realism' of a sort among the Barthians, but what is needed is a theology based upon the results of biblical scholarship . . . here is the greatest gold mine of all for those who seek the riches of God." . . . "Christian theology in our time has made a striking recovery from the onslaughts of liberalism and positivism which seemed to threaten it a generation ago. In this recovery Continental thought has . . . taken the initiative." . . . "There is every evidence that God is using all these threads to weave the rich tapestry of the

Christianity of the future." . . . "Few theologians in Christian history have done greater violence to the historical character of Old Testament revelation (than Karl Barth)" . . . "Today we do know something of the Jesus of history. Tomorrow we shall know more. And that understanding . . . will bring home to our scholarship, and to our devotion, the meaning of history and of life." . . . "Religious experience . . . when grounded in faith it captures the whole man and guarantees his integration, not around a value or an ideal, but in the existent being which is God." . . . "The unusual combination of variety, democracy, activism, missionary interest, and cooperation indicates that our churches are well-equipped for their task if they apply the heritage of our religious history." . . . "We are properly fearful of the so-called denominator in our search for unity, but it would be well for us not to overlook the dynamic effect of Christian love in our aspiration towards a reunited Christendom." . . . "The unity of the Christian Church is a vital factor in realizing the unity of mankind." . . . "We do not face the most bitter problem of the Christian life until we acknowledge that there are situations in which the best we can do is evil." . . . "The call to all mankind is to live the religion they profess." . . . "The true function of Christianity is not to busy itself overmuch with economic and political reforms but to save civilization from itself by revealing to men the true end of life and the true nature of reality, by pointing out that the power of ruling originates not from the mass of the people but from God." . . . "The most the average clergyman should do with psychiatry is to give 'psychiatric first aid.'" . . . "With all the progress that the Church has made in its attitude toward humanitarian society, she has still far to go in applying the principle of the brotherhood of man in her social attitudes and relationships." . . . "A theology for Christian education is needed . . . The

liberalism of today is greatly chastened but still significant, and neo-orthodox theology has not made great inroads on American thought." . . . "Only about one-fourth of the American ministers have had a full training of four years of college and three years of seminary; only one-half have had one or the other."

These samples ought to invite many to buy this book for careful perusal. It is written with a clarity which fits the wishes of the layman: yet it has an accuracy of scholarship and a depth of interpretation which stimulate the professional theologian. In particular a fine unity threads the essays; and I have the personal feeling that the kind of Christianity these writers are interpreting is the type that people living in the American scene vastly need in their efforts for the Kingdom.

THOMAS S. KEPLER

Lawrence College

The Christian and the War. By CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON, Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1942. 145 pages. \$1.50.

Following Pearl Harbor and America's declaration of war against the axis a great many people were compelled to face a question which previously to that time had been largely academic. That question was, "What attitude can a Christian take toward war?"

Dr. Morrison, distinguished editor of the *Christian Century*, frankly admits that he was numbered in that group. Two possible positions seemed to him untenable. He could not accept the reasoning of the Christian militarists which makes war "justifiable because necessary;" neither could he feel at ease among the pacifists to whom "participation in any war, under any circumstances, is unthinkable."

Yet as a leader of Christian thought he faced the necessity of seeking an adequate answer to the above question in terms of an acceptable third position, a position not

only personally satisfying, but also worthy of serious consideration by his readers. As a first step toward such a goal, he wrote on December 9, 1941, while the presses were waiting, an editorial entitled "An Unnecessary Necessity." This editorial will long be a high watermark in the field of religious journalism.

However, no man could outline his thinking in one editorial. Steadily week by week he added other editorials to light up the various facets of the subject under consideration. This book is a gathering together of those editorials, subjected only to minor changes, in the exact order in which they appeared.

That which was "seen in part" may now be seen, perhaps not as "that which is perfect," but at least as that which is whole. The philosophy of Dr. Morrison stands revealed as it could not in the piecemeal presentation which the original publication of these editorials made necessary.

Here is sound thinking on the attitude which a Christian may consistently adopt toward that most un-Christian of institutions—War!

IVAN GEROULD GRIMSHAW

*American International College
Springfield, Mass.*

Philosophy and Theology

Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture.

By WERNER JAEGER. Translated from the German Manuscript by GILBERT HIGHET. Volume III: The Conflict of Cultural Ideals in the Age of Plato. New York: Oxford University Press, 1944. viii+34 pages. \$3.75; the set of three volumes, \$10.00.

The third and final volume of this great work, as Professor Jaeger promised, has appeared promptly after the second (which was reviewed in an earlier issue of this JOURNAL).

This volume, which complements

the second, is of necessity less organic. For in the second the towering personalities of Socrates and Plato dominated the stage, and presented a developing but unified ideal of Greek culture. Here, on the contrary, conflict and tragedy prevail. Plato is still present, but more and more on the defensive. In *Phaedrus* (ch. 8) he proves that rhetoric, the training of orators and writers, is futile without philosophy, without knowledge, for the orator has a moral function and should please God rather than men (pp. 193 f.). Incidentally, we may compare with *Phaedrus* the current debate about our Schools of Education (should they emphasize methods or contents?). In Plato's *seventh letter* we witness his failure to put into practice his political ideals at Syracuse (ch. 9). And in the *Laws* the aged philosopher left us his unfinished notes (edited by his secretary Philip of Opus) in which the principles of the *Republic* are applied to practical problems of education, culminating in the transformation of the legislator into the teacher of the citizens (ch. 10).

Isocrates (pp. 46-155), the orator and teacher of rhetoric (436-338 B. C.), was the greatest rival of Plato the philosopher (427-347 B. C.). He attacked Plato, the teachers of politics, and, more contemptuously, the writers of forensic speeches, in the name of rhetoric, as he conceives it, i. e., "entirely political culture" aiming at "spiritual leadership in the state" through "a new approach to life and its problems" (p. 67); and in his *Panegyricus* he immortalized "the new partnership between culture and awakening national sentiment" (p. 74). For better or (as this reviewer believes) for worse, the educational ideals of Isocrates have prevailed over Plato's since the Renaissance.

The first chapter in the book is an illuminating and learned discussion of "Greek Medicine as *Paideia*." Here, aside from interesting details of medical history, we learn

of the mutual relation of medicine and natural philosophy. The seventh chapter deals with Xenophon; and the last one, on Demosthenes, shows how "the Greeks were not able to think of giving up the independence of their city-states, any more than to-day we have been able to think *in practice* of giving up our national states in favor of any more comprehensive form of state" (p. 266). Nevertheless, they lost their independence in 338 B. C. Aside from its value as a historical study, Jaeger's *Paideia* contains much solid food for thought, sorely needed by the present generation of men.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

Harvard University

The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit. By FRED GLADSTONE BRATTON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. xi+319 pages. \$2.50.

In the present volume, Dr. Bratton has made a valuable addition to the interpretation of liberalism, which, if not identical with the cause of democracy, is closely allied to it. In the light of the present it is interesting to note how America began. Our author remarks (143) that:

Jefferson, Franklin, Thomas Paine, Hopkins, Ethan Allen, John Adams, Wythe, Robert Paine, Bartlett, Rush, Thornton, Jones, Randolph, Washington, and Mason were either deists, free thinkers, or religious liberals with deistic tendencies.

Dr. Bratton's book is one more evidence that liberalism is very much alive.

The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit treats, in alternate chapters, great liberals and liberal movements. The chapters on men (Origen, Erasmus, Voltaire, Paine, Parker, Darwin, Dewey) on the whole excel in vividness those on movements (from Early Christian Radicalism to Twentieth-Century Naturalism). Yet every chapter makes a fresh approach, and is written in vigorous and quotable style. To the reviewer, the treatments of Origen and Voltaire were es-

pecially satisfactory. The chapter on Paine should lead to a rereading of Bishop McConnell's recent essay on the same man. It is possible that the lasting importance of Dewey is somewhat exaggerated.

In general, the style is lucid, attractive, and correct, although Origen's "infallible view" (10) does not mean what it says. Origen's view of the infallibility of Scripture is meant. This reviewer entertains a pet dislike for the phrase "stabbed a nation awake" (256), a figure of which peaceful professors and preachers are much too fond. Maupertuis appears as "Maupertius" (94). A fictional character of Franklin's appears both as "Mrs. Dogood" and "Mrs. Dogwood" (147). "Perfectability" does duty for "perfectibility," (278), but this may be the fault of C. F. Potter, from whom it is quoted. These defects are rare exceptions in a book that is well-written and well-proofread.

One can take few exceptions to the ideas presented. Liberalism appears more as a rebellion against tradition than as a ferment of purifying criticism within tradition. Hence the commitment to humanistic and naturalistic theories is emphasized more than the wholly free use of reason, and humanism is made to seem more influential than it really is. The author seems to be too much under the influence of contemporary extremes when he finds current thought forced into a choice between neosupernaturalism and naturalistic humanism. No such tendency was manifest at the 1943 New York meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, where moderate liberalism dominated papers and discussions without challenge from either extreme. Neo-orthodoxy will derive no comfort, however, from Bratton's exposition of the dilemma.

The book closes with a set of useful bibliographies and a careful index.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN
Boston University

Man: Real and Ideal. By Edwin Grant Conklin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. xvii+247 pages. \$2.50.

Man: Real and Ideal is a fascinating title; Edwin Grant Conklin of Princeton is one of America's most famous biologists. A reviewer expects much from such a combination. The book turns out to be a reprint and revision of the lectures delivered and published at Rice Institute in 1941 under the title, *What is Man?* Much of it is a competent summary of familiar facts about evolution, genetics, and heredity, which might well have been presupposed or presented much more briefly. The points of view which are expressed are, in the main, wholesome: a teleological view of nature, a liberal and rational view of religion, full recognition of the higher values in the light of science. Yet, unfortunately, the treatment of the "ideal," while more stimulating than that of the "real," is less cogent and more opinionated than one would expect. At best, the ideal is discussed poetically and aphoristically rather than philosophically. A few examples will illustrate the nature of the book.

Much is said about values, but the fundamental treatment of science and values is impatient, almost angry, rather than enlightening. Conklin says: "It is impossible for a scientist, or any one accustomed to deal with evidence or to face reality, to appreciate the statement that science has nothing to do with values" (171). This sentence needs analysis and explanation. No one denies that science has something to do with values, but Conklin fails to make clear in what sense physics, or chemistry or biology yields a moral or an aesthetic or a religious norm, and if it does, how Nazis, Japanese, British, and Americans can use the same sciences in the service of conflicting norms. He uses the loose phrase, "the ethics of science," without showing how science can measure or test competing

value-claims. He is so eager to defend the moral integrity of scientists that he forgets the amoral neutrality of science.

Idealistic philosophy fares even worse than values at Conklin's hands. For him idealism is a "philosophy that denies the reality of an external world" (157), and would "lead to a repudiation of science and its methods." This is an instance of the fairly common, but historically unjustified, identification of idealism with solipsism. As a matter of fact, idealism assumes the reality of an external world and then seeks to define that reality in a way coherent with the facts of experience and the results of science. No good is done when great systems of thought are recklessly caricatured. Nor is there much light shed when Conklin says: "Idealists forget realities when they picture the dignity and value of every human being" (214); as a matter of fact, idealists have not pictured man as perfect, but they have ascribed potential value, and hence human rights, to all men—yes, even to "robbers, gangsters, and rapists," whom the author cites.

On immortality, Conklin is impressed by "biological" and "social immortality," but he is sure that there is "no sound scientific evidence" (179) in favor of personal immortality, which he calls "an endless life of conscious pleasure" (182). But in rejecting personal immortality he overlooks the Pickwickian meaning of biological and social "immortality," and also fails to see that there is no "sound scientific evidence," in the rigid sense, for any ideal values whatever. His own basic faith is not derived from science, but from "the point from which one takes the path that leads to hope or to despair" (193). That point, for him, is a decision based not on science, but on a very subjective pragmatism. "No one can furnish scientific proof of the existence or nature of God, nor of a divine plan" (205). Yet he accepts such ideals as lending "strength and courage to mortal man"

(205). Science cannot prove immortality, he had said; hence we reject it. Science cannot prove God, but we believe.—Clear first principles are lacking here. "The religion of science leaves to us faith in the worth and dignity and almost boundless possibilities of man" (205)—a faith much like that which he earlier ascribed to "idealists who forget realities."

In spite of a lack of well-organized reasons for the faith that is in him, Conklin closes his book on a high plane of social idealism. "Nothing less than a planetary system of ethics will suffice in so small a world as this" (195). He protests against the Rex Stout school of thought (197-198), which relies on hatred for victory, and commits his faith to the ideal religion of love (211). He is acutely aware of the race problem, and points out that the present war might have been avoided had we heeded the warning of a Japanese delegate to Versailles, that no Asiatic nation could be happy in a League of Nations in which sharp racial discrimination was maintained (224).

If one is looking for rational defense of the ideal life, he will not find it here. But if he is looking for the working faith of a great scientist, he will find considerable to enlighten and inspire him.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.
Boston University.

What is a Mature Morality? By HAROLD H. TITUS. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943. 229 pages.

If one is looking for a good introduction to Christian ethics written from a liberal point of view, this small volume by Professor Titus is to be recommended. It is a balanced, well arranged and lucidly written presentation.

Disturbed over contemporary moral confusion, the author deals briefly with the Fascist denial of moral values and the relativist denial that moral judgments can be objective. As against these threats to moral-

ity, he finds the basis for a moral order in a reflective approach to the needs of human personalities. Christian ethics, if understood in dynamic and functional terms (rather than as an authoritarian system stemming from revelation), is held to be a completed form of the philosophical theory of self-realization. "The spirit of Jesus is expressed as a supreme concern for human values. The Christian life is thus a quest for the good under the inspiration of devotion to the ideals of Jesus."

The marks of a mature morality, as set forth in the central chapter of the book, indicate the sort of emphasis that a dynamic Christian morality will make. It will judge right and wrong relative to persons and human welfare, will draw no racial or national boundaries to moral obligation, will place a premium upon intelligence and knowledge, will rely upon inner rather than outer controls, will see the mutual implications of means and ends, will recognize that for a better world we need *both* transformed individuals *and* social reconstruction, will allow for growth, and be willing to interpret human duties as duties to God, thus giving cosmic significance to the moral life.

Readers approaching problems of conduct from a psychological standpoint, in which emancipation from all authoritative absolutes is regarded as a primary condition of emotional maturity, may object to linking a "mature" morality with theology. But Professor Titus' use of theology is so free from any shade of authoritarianism that the objection loses its force.

The author's "realism" is a characteristic feature of this book. Nowhere is this more evident than in his treatment of the difficult questions of the place of compromise and of experimentation in the moral life. Nor is he content merely with laying down general principles in abstraction from their practical bearings. For him a moral issue is always a problem of personal choice

governing action; even to learn and understand a moral truth or ideal completely requires participation in the struggle to put it into practice. True to his own prescription, the author explores the practical implications of his principles for economic, political, and international relations.

The excellence of this book is out of proportion to its size. It deserves a wide reading and will commend itself for class room uses.

HERMAN BRAUTIGAM

Colgate University

The Divine-Human Encounter. By EMIL BRUNNER, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943, 207 pages. \$2.50.

Amandus W. Loos of Spelman College in Atlanta, has done an excellent piece of work in translating Brunner's Upsala lectures of 1937 under the title, *The Divine-Human Encounter*. Brunner's position—conservative, holding to the Bible as "final authority," but at numerous points critical of Barth—is well known to the scholarly religious public.

The present work is a shade closer to the liberal position than most of Brunner's other writing has been. After a chapter on objectivism and subjectivism—in which extremes of each position are rejected—Brunner proceeds in the remainder of the book to develop the Biblical conception, as he sees it. He overcomes "the subject-object antithesis" by the concept of personal trust in a personal God (see 75). The "divine-human encounter" is "the meeting of person with person" (85), and its result is *agape* (91). He objects to abstract truths: "we are dealing, not with truths, not even with divinely revealed truths, but with God, with Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit" (112). In this passage, Brunner reveals a commendable distaste for the purely abstract, and emphasizes the "truth" that all truth is personal; but in the paradoxical denial of truths he goes further than most

personalists would care to go, either in philosophy or in theology.

Carrying out his personalistic principle, he rejects Bible-orthodoxy as well as dogma-orthodoxy, because both apply "the general concept of truth to revelation instead of surmounting this understanding of truth by means of revelation" (153). Here, however, we are in a fog. No sensible empiricist would, it is true, wish to judge religious or Biblical experience by criteria derived from other experience (biological or Vedic). On the other hand, it is difficult to see what religion would mean were it to claim exemption from all "general" logic, and be free to indulge at will in the most arbitrary contradictions and incoherencies. Brunner's words are open to criticism as exhibiting the vices of both extreme subjectivism and extreme objectivism.

In spite of certain inconsistencies, such as the above, the present work is one of the most clear and refreshing of Brunner's writings. It is dominated by frank commitment to the principle of personality and the interpretation of Biblical truth as a relation of personal correspondence between the Word of God (God himself, not a book) and human obedience-in-faith. Brunner sees the perils of ecclesiasticism and neo-orthodoxy (38, 40, 170, 171), and has little or nothing to say of the perils of liberalism, except in the extreme form of subjectivism. "The age of Orthodoxy appears like a frozen waterfall—mighty shapes of movement, but no movement" (31). Brunner seems to be moving, as is Nels Ferré, toward a new synthesis which may greatly enrich modern Christianity.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN
Boston University

The Challenge of Israel's Faith. By G. ERNEST WRIGHT. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944. x+108 pages. \$1.50.

It is a rather unusual pleasure to review a book which one can commend without

reserve, but this is such a book. While the author, as a recognized authority in archaeology and as editor of the *Biblical Archaeologist*, has given us abundant reason to expect good things of him, nothing he has done previously has quite prepared us for anything as good as this. Writing with the sure touch of competent scholarship, he carries his learning lightly. He writes more like a prophet than an archaeologist. The crucial relevance of the Old Testament for our day is presented with unique force and clarity in this little volume.

The book is concerned with the basic theological convictions of Israel's faith for which eternal validity and decisive importance to the modern Christian may be claimed. In spite of the long development of Hebrew religion, Dr. Wright finds in it a striking uniformity. Since space does not permit a summary of the book's contents, suffice it to say that the six chapters treat respectively the eternal Word behind the words of Scripture, the meaning of history, the significance of the fact that God is represented in the Old Testament as King rather than Father, the living, personal nature of the God of Israel, the conception of the covenanted people as a divinely ruled society, and the ultimate divine order which is to be the outcome of history.

A postscript acknowledges that the Old Testament is neither complete nor final, but claims that it is not only indispensable for understanding the New Testament but also full of positive and largely unutilized material for Christian preaching and teaching. Protesting against the general departure of modern theology from biblical approach to truth, Dr. Wright laments also the undeniable fact that biblical teaching and scholarship have largely been either too superficial or too specialized and detached to be spiritually fruitful. He welcomes, however, the perceptible signs of a new dawn, as one of which the reader gladly reckons this book itself.

Of course, if one felt that a review must

at all costs be critical, it would be easy to pick out points here and there to criticize. One might wish, for example, that the influence of a certain brilliant colleague of the author did not stick out quite so often or so conspicuously; it is hardly, however, a baleful influence. Or again, the index gives a curious impression of spottiness as regards topics and authorities, but this is obviously because the material has been used selectively, and the index shows what has actually been used rather than the basic sources of facts and ideas. Why an index should have been thought necessary in a work of this nature and of such limited compass is, by the way, not clear. On some important points of interpretation there is room for difference of opinion. No book so forthright and emphatic could expect to find unanimous approval in every detail. The total picture, however, is sharp, clear, and accurate. The book has the rare merit of being positive without being reactionary.

Extraordinarily forceful ways of putting things appear so frequently that the reviewer is tempted to quote many sentences. Instead he will merely say, *Sume, lege.*

MILLER BURROWS

Yale University.

The Problem of Pain. By C. S. LEWIS.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943.
148 pp. \$1.50.

The Oxford don who has recently published *The Screwtape Letters*, *The Case for Christianity*, and several other books has shown himself to be one of the ablest and most persuasive proponents of positive Christianity to be found among literary figures of the present time. This little volume, dealing with a problem of great poignancy and religious seriousness, is written with a most admirable vigor, simplicity, and directness. It is distinguished both by a compassionate insight into the human situation and a penetrating knowledge of the resources of Christian thought.

The basic problem is quite simple: can one believe in a God who is both omnipotent and good, in any significant sense, in view of the facts of pain? Mr. Lewis is perfectly clear in stating that he does not believe that the Christian idea of God is derived from experience in the ordinary way of inference and generalization: "Christianity is not the conclusion of a philosophical debate on the origins of the universe: it is a catastrophic historical event following on the long spiritual preparation of humanity . . . It is not a system into which we have to fit the awkward fact of pain: it is itself one of the awkward facts which have to be fitted into any system we make."

The first hurdle which has to be surmounted is that created by loose thinking about divine omnipotence. To hold that God is omnipotent does not mean that He can do what is intrinsically impossible. He cannot do what is incompatible with His purposes or the means which are necessary to realize them. The regularity of nature and the neutrality of matter with respect to moral values are apparently among these necessary means and conditions. Having made man a free and responsible being, it was necessary that God should permit man to suffer the consequences of his mistakes and wrongs, for only in this way can he learn by experience and make good his freedom.

But can we say then that God is good, if He employs pain as an instrument of educating mankind? Yes, replies Mr. Lewis, provided this means is necessary (and we have seen that it is), and provided further, that the end to be attained is worth the cost. And this Christianity affirms when it declares that man's highest good is to know and to glorify God. Mr. Lewis wisely says, "It is not simply that God has arbitrarily made us such that He is our only good. Rather, God is the only good of all creatures, and by necessity, each must find

its good in that kind and degree of the fruition of God which is proper to its nature . . . To be God—to be like God and to share His goodness in creaturely response—to be miserable—these are the only three alternatives."

But why does not God let man alone, leaving him to seek such relative goods as he can find unaided, rather than torturing him into seeking the supreme good? For two reasons: first, because as a matter of fact no lesser good will ultimately satisfy the restless aspirations of man, and second, because God *loves* his creatures and cannot do other than impel them to seek their true and highest good.

This is without question an impressive theodicy, a bold and forthright justification of the ways of God to men. This reader, however, is left with two questions: First, does it adequately deal with the problems of the intensity and the distribution of pain? We can and should believe that pain is educational and that more often than is commonly believed it can be made a means to the perfecting of character. But can all pain be thus justified? Second, does not this argument prove too much? This may indeed be the best of all *possible* worlds, but will it not dull the edge of moral effort for us to believe that it is? Will men strive to the utmost to remove pain and its causes if they really believe that it is God's necessary instrument for bringing them to their highest good?

JOHN M. MOORE

Swarthmore College

Psychology

In Search of Maturity. An Inquiry into Psychology, Religion, and Self-Education. By FRITZ KUNKEL, M. D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. xii+292 pages. \$2.75.

The problem confronting every growing individual, as Dr. Kunkel sees it, is to keep his conscious Ego, or convenient evaluation

of himself, in harmony with the ideal demands of his real Self. The real Self, according to this Jungian variety of depth-psychology, is the unconscious, creative, but always imperfectly known, center of human personality. The Unconscious harbors no Freudian, pleasure-seeking, unsocial libido; in it are anchored the spiritual motifs of the universe, creative human brotherhood and Divine concern. The real Self therefore is not "I"; it is "We." Our conscious Egos, on the other hand, are only largely conventionalized "sham-centers," erected and kept rigid to avoid unselfish commitment, but actually creating more personal and social heart-break.

In Freudian psychology, the Ego represses libidinal impulses in conformity with conceived societal restrictions. In this psychology the hard-boiled Ego is the barrier to the full expression of social and Cosmic creativity. "The Ego keeps the powers unconscious, and the ['collective,' 'We'] powers, threatening to destroy the Ego, force it to defend itself with all its shrewdness and cunning."

Thus, if we are to avoid "sin," we must develop a creative, positive relationship to God and man in place of calculating egocentrism. For when the Ego supersedes the real Self and supplants the native experience of "We," disaster ensues. The individual may try to save *himself* by making a veritable Idol out of a Group, Individual, or Cause, but all methods of salvation short of complete commitment to God for God's sake, and to the Group as God's Group, will fail in creativity. The methods and principles of regaining creativity are developed in Part III, "Depth-Psychology in Self-Education."

There is so much in this book that is keen, refreshing, and spiritually profound that one hesitates to criticize it, especially since criticism from the outside is taken to be one of the barriers an unregenerate Ego places against the Truth. Nevertheless, this

book does represent a dogmatic theology, and a dogmatic psychology,—with all due respect to the researches of the Jungian School.

Granted "the decisive presupposition that there is a will of God and that God is creative," how do we know that "to cooperate with the creative will of God" means that "we should develop our own creativity?" Are we called upon to grant a specific "conservative" theology with its possible metaphysical and ethical difficulties in order to give meaning to a certain view of the Unconscious, or are we finding in the Unconscious a psychological corroboration of a theology?

One gladly grants that the causes of human suffering lie ultimately in human unwillingness to be creative at the risk of failure, but does this Christian insight involve the fundamental thesis that our psychological grounding is an innate, tribal and Divine unconscious, with its Eve, Venus, Cinderella, Black Giant, and other symbolic images? Because there is so much independent psychological insight in the Christian world-view, let us be careful that we do not bind it to the presuppositions or deductions of a depth-psychology whose clarity seems to depend on a specific theological interpretation, and whose "contributions" raise as many problems as they solve.

PETER A. BERTOCCI

Bates College

The Bible

Daily Life in Bible Times. By ALBERT E. BAILEY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. 328 pages. \$3.00.

As the title suggests Dr. Bailey pictures the living conditions and general environment in the various periods of biblical history. In so doing he draws from the vast results of archaeology in recent years, as well as the thought of modern scholarship. The book, therefore, while not exhaustive in scope does bring to life many of the

biblical scenes with a freshness and interest that aids the student of the bible in coming to an understanding of the more complete picture. The interesting narrative is augmented and enhanced by a very fine collection of illustrations and drawings.

The Patriarchal period is depicted in several phases after a brief introduction to the early prehistoric times. Mesopotamian life is described around the setting of Ur; nomadic civilization is depicted in the environment of Palestine; and the Pharaohs of Egypt and their subjects round out the picture. An interesting chapter on the seafaring peoples of the ancient world provides the transition to Palestine and the period of Judges. Canaanitic civilization is presented with the background of Megiddo and its rich excavations. The transition of the Hebrew nomad into the Israelite farmer is likewise woven into the picture. The fine buildings of Solomon's day are introduced by a section on overland travel and the caravan routes, revenue from which made possible a measure of the luxury that was Solomon's. For the period of Israel's divided monarchy and the last century of Judah's survival, the author presents an interesting imaginative picture built around the prophet Isaiah. The scene shifts with the exiles, and Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian life receive interesting analysis. The Old Testament period is concluded by a trip to Alexandria in the Greek period. Here one goes on a sightseeing tour of the city's life and splendour with special reference given to the Jewish colony.

The New Testament section is more brief. One long chapter presents the Palestinian scene especially in Galilee and at Jerusalem in the time of Jesus. A second chapter deals with the first century of Christianity. It is built around the letters of Paul and the book of Acts. Christian life in Corinth, Ephesus and Rome is described as representing three different approaches to early Christianity.

Occasionally, detailed descriptions of buildings or the like become slightly wearisome, but on the whole the volume is very engagingly written. Dr. Bailey has a fertile imagination which serves as a vehicle for his facts and figures. For instance, the description of Solomon's temple and palace area is built into a tour for the Crown Prince of Tyre conducted by Ahijah, a royal scribe. The Canaanitic worship of Astarte is seen through the eyes of a visiting Hebrew, Joel and his host Peridea, a citizen of Megiddo. Jerusalem of Jesus' day is seen when James the son of Zebedee makes his first Passover pilgrimage.

There is not space in this review to make a critical study of the contents. A few minor shortcomings may be simply noted. While the volume is replete with notes and references, there are still passages that need authentication. It is especially important in a work such as this which makes use of fact, legend and imagination. Further the author somewhat confuses the relationship between Israelite and Canaanite. He does recognize the Israelite as a fusion of the Canaanite city dweller and the migrant Hebrew, but he complicates the situation by using the term Israelite before the fusion has taken place. Perhaps the biggest weakness is the picture of Judaism which one derives from this book especially in the section on Jesus' day. It tends to follow the Gospel tradition and present only the negative side. Judaism, therefore, appears in a weakened form even though the belief that it was a strong faith with much to offer would seem to be nearer the facts of the case. There are minor errors also which are understandable in view of the scope of the work. The Israelitic name for God is spelled both as Yahweh (p. 54) and as Jahweh (p. 49). Jehoiachim is said to be the king who rebelled against Nebuchadrezzar when it was actually his father Jehoiakim (p. 215).

Its contribution, however, far outweighs

these limitations. Here is a work well worth the reading upon the part of any one interested in the Bible. It is not technical and not wordy but rather, fresh and simply written. It helps to take the Bible out of a pigeon hole of religious doctrine and make it live as a record of human experience. It serves the general reader well and would fit in nicely as secondary source reading in biblical courses.

EUGENE S. ASHTON

Goucher College

The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus. By J. N. SANDERS. (Cambridge University Press). New York: The Macmillan Company. 1943.

This scholarly essay forms one part of a series which its author has projected, whose purpose is to determine the rôle which the study of the New Testament played in controlling the development of early Christian doctrine, and the extent to which the teaching of early Christian writers represents an adequate interpretation and re-statement of the teaching of the New Testament. In this essay the study is confined to the Fourth Gospel and its influence on the development of Christian theology. The author scrutinizes with great care the passages in the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists which might be assumed to show the influence of the Fourth Gospel upon them.

The approach to the early Christian writings is made through the so-called Johannine writings, other than the Gospel. Dismissing quickly the possibility of a common authorship for the Gospel and the book of Revelation, Mr. Sanders passes to a more detailed consideration of the Johannine epistles. He concludes that the epistles do not come from the same hand as the Gospel. This separation of the Gospel from the epistles plays an important part in the

later argument which the essay advances, for the author finds it necessary to place the origin of the epistles in Asia Minor, and thus, it is only by divorcing them from the gospel that he can advance his view that the Gospel arose in Alexandria.

His scrutiny of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers leads the author to the conclusion that a common body of tradition lay behind the Letters of Ignatius, the Epistle of Barnabas, The Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle to Diognetus, and the Fourth Gospel, but that dependence of any of the former writings upon the Fourth Gospel is not revealed.

It is in the Apologists that Mr. Sanders finds the first indisputable traces of the influence of the Fourth Gospel. Slight in Justin and Tatian, these traces become certainties in Theophilus, who is the first of the Christian writers whose works we now possess to ascribe the Gospel to "John."

Mr. Sanders next studies the bearing of this evidence for the use of the Fourth Gospel by the Apologists on the problem of the authorship of the Gospel and the place of its origin. He reaches the conclusion here that the author was not a disciple of Jesus, though he may have used materials which came to him through a Jerusalem disciple. He believes that the place of origin which best accounts for the evidence is Alexandria. Some of the evidence presented for the provenance of the Gospel as Alexandria is the use of the Gospel by the Alexandrian Gnostics. He also finds it in the similarity of the Logos concept in the Gospel to that of Philo, and in the polemic which the Gospel directs against both Docetic Christianity, and Judaizing tendencies. (The church in Alexandria is held to be the only one in which both tendencies were actively in operation).

The final section of the essay is devoted to an examination of the use made of the Gospel by the Alexandrian Gnostics and

by Irenaeus. The author finds that the Valentinians used the Fourth Gospel to a far greater extent than had Basilides. The similarities between the Valentinian system of thought and the Gospel are shown to lie both in language and in ideas. Mr. Sanders' study of Irenaeus and the Gospel convinces him that the Fourth Gospel was of cardinal importance to Irenaeus. It was Irenaeus, he believes, who established the teaching of the Fourth Gospel as normative for Catholic theology, and Irenaeus who was responsible for the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel as canonical. The total conclusion drawn from the study is that the Fourth Gospel worked powerfully both in Gnostic and in apologetic doctrine in the second century, until in Irenaeus one finds its influence dominant. In Irenaeus also Catholic doctrine is found for the first time clearly and fully expounded.

The importance of Mr. Sanders' volume is quite out of proportion to its size. It is a small and compact study, a fine example of closely compressed painstaking and scholarly work. It is a work of both careful scholarship and real erudition. Not all students of the Fourth Gospel will accept its conclusions. Many, for instance, will feel that the tradition of the Ephesian origin of the Fourth Gospel has been too quickly dismissed. But whether or not it persuades its readers to accept particular conclusions, it will awaken their admiration for its fresh approach to old problems, and its original and competent dealing with the early Christian writings. One is grateful for the writer's promise of a further series of studies along this same line of inquiry. Readers of this essay will rejoice that the author has been encouraged to this further task by the fact that this study was chosen as the Kaye Prize Essay in Cambridge University in 1939.

MARY ELY LYMAN

Sweet Briar College

The Varieties of New Testament Religion.

By ERNEST F. SCOTT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943, vi+310 pages. \$2.75.

Students of the teachings of the New Testament will welcome Professor Scott's latest book as an endeavor to reach a balance between the conception of the New Testament as a static unity and the view that it contains a variety of interpretations and lacks any unifying principle. Avoiding both extremes, he presents in a clear analytical style the ideas of the writers as an achievement of unity through variety. This unity springs from the spiritual liberty in the early church. In seeking to express their "passionate convictions" and "to affirm Christian facts" (8), the writers, overwhelmed with the richness of the many-sided message, used varieties of ideas in presenting the phase of the new life in Christ most important to them. Thus, each writer, believing that he possessed the spirit, described that facet of the diamond of truth which the spirit presented to him. That the New Testament contains these various presentations is the best evidence of its essential unity.

The emphasis on the continuity between the law and the gospel would have been strengthened by greater stress on the ethical aspect of the Jewish law and Christ's interpretation of its true spirit. In the chapter on Hellenistic Christianity, the similarities between pagan religions and Christianity are shown to be an aid in preparing Gentiles to accept the gospel. An example is the stress on religious life as union with deity. Paul's conversion is considered as basic to his theology, and, unlike some recent writers, the author presents Paul's teachings as essentially the same as the teachings of Christ. The values of the apocalyptic material in the New Testament (188) are rooted in the apocalyptic literature of the Intertestamental period rather

than in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The chapter on the moralists reveals the importance of ethics grounded in religious sanctions and is a valuable antidote to a cynical view of morals as merely relative to the age. After presenting the epistle of Hebrews as an expression of Latin Christianity, and discussing John's gospel as historically based and written from a religious viewpoint, the author concludes the book with a chapter on the New Testament as a display of the essential unity of the early church. External pressures only brought to the surface a unity which had always existed. Thus, despite various views, the church had a common faith based on certain well established facts.

That Luke "describes as Christians" (134) the disciples at Antioch may be questioned, for he seems to present them as followers of John the Baptist who gladly received Paul's Christian message. John's statement of his thesis in John 20:30-31, and the manner in which he pictures incidents in Christ's life as finally leading to the climax in Thomas' triumphant cry of faith, make it doubtful whether it is even correct to conclude partially that this gospel is written "to affirm the true humanity of Jesus." (261). This statement would be more correctly used of the first epistle of John. Because of the author's stress on the unity in diversity in the New Testament, the reader is surprised to find that the New Testament is "full of inconsistencies (2) and contains discrepancies (36)." One important note missed in this book is the stress of the New Testament writers on sin and their view that Christ's death is linked with the defeat of sin.

Many will desire to own this book because of the insight it gives into vital elements of New Testament teaching. It is indeed a contribution to the study of the theology of the New Testament. The stress on Christian liberty as the means whereby,

through diversity, the essential unity of the gospel was found is of value in a day when new applications of the gospel are being sought.

EARLE E. CAIRNS

Wheaton, Illinois.

Jesus

The Short Story of Jesus. By WALTER LOWRIE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. xv+224 pages. \$2.50.

Walter Lowrie, who has also done pioneer work on Barth and on Kierkegaard, was one of the first to translate Schweitzer into English. His translation from Schweitzer's *Abendmahl* was done before the last war, though publication was delayed until 1925. Lowrie's very able *Jesus According to Mark* appeared in 1929. It is now out of print as a result of the blitz in London, though a new edition has been prepared for later publication. The present book is a simpler presentation of the life of Christ, not an abbreviation of the *Mark*, and free from extensive critical discussion.

Dr. Lowrie writes out of an unusual equipment of scholarship, personal culture, and insight; in particular, he has a persuasive view of the meaning of Schweitzer's eschatology, and it is his use of this which gives special quality to his books on Jesus. Any sketch of the life of Jesus to be effective must avoid sentimentalism, modernization, and eclecticism. Lowrie has a distinctive insight and follows it through rigorously. In this volume also, he sticks closely to Mark and stresses the urgency and the demand of the Gospel in eschatological terms.

Schweitzer remarks that Jesus put an end to apocalyptic eschatology. Gradually his disciples learned to transmute it into an unapocalyptic eschatology. This can be done without the loss of essential values, if only we preserve, as St. Paul did, a vivid sense of a brink, a crisis, 'the arm of the Lord,' 'the glory which shall be revealed in us,' the *life* which threatens to 'swallow up' our mortality—and do not chain ourselves again

to the dreary 'wheel of life,' from which we shall need a new Buddha to deliver us."

In a way, indeed, it is strange now in 1944 to read a sketch of the life of Jesus so much like the outline that was given English readers in 1910 in Schweitzer's *Quest*. Here again we find the familiar features: the reversal in chronology of the Transfiguration and the confession of Peter; the interpretation of the Feeding of the Multitude as a sacrament of the Kingdom of which the participants were unaware; the correlation of Jesus' apocalyptic anticipations with the seasons; acceptance of Jesus' predictions of the Passion, the ransom saying, etc. Indeed, the chief drawback of the book lies in the fact that Mark is so largely trusted. Lowrie does, indeed, recognize the confusion of the central part of Mark. But even in the early parts of the story he accepts at face value the confession of the demons and the allegorization of the parables in Mark 4. And when Lowrie reaches the end of the Galilean period he says: "Mark's account is here (i. e. henceforth) treated as thoroughly trustworthy, not only for the sequence of events, but in the minutest details."

The gain in following Schweitzer, however, is greater than the loss, particularly as the writer revises and interprets Schweitzer and adds so much of his own. The bulk of the episodes are handled in a way that is alive. A great deal of informed criticism and interpretation is made available to the general reader in a clear and persuasive way. The stature of Jesus is maintained at the same time as a frank recognition of his alien outlook. A unity of impression is conveyed both by the firm grasp of the portrait and by the very brevity of the book. Lowrie manages to transcend the dilemma of fact versus value, history versus piety. He says at one point, "This is not primarily a devotional book. And I reflect that devotional comment fails to inspire real

devotion, so long as the hearers do not really believe that the story is substantially true . . ." Lowrie does sometimes put our historical conscience to a test, for example with the ambiguity of his position on the birth narratives in Luke. He is bold to say that Matthew's narratives are legend but he will not say the same for Luke. We wish that he had followed out here the logic of his own book, *The Birth of the Divine Child*.

In closing we would like to call attention to a number of statements that we believe are in error. Mary of Magdala is said to be identified by Luke with the woman who was a sinner. The accent in *Eli* is "indicated in the Greek text" (as if the accents went back to the autograph, page 21). Nazareth was "remote from the Lake of Galilee" and John was baptizing at the time that Jesus went to him "on the side of (the Jordan) just opposite Galilee." Matthew had no interest in apocalyptic eschatology (p. 67). "Except for the cause of fornication" . . . means, of course, unchastity before marriage" (p. 138) "Jesus neither affirms nor implies that a woman who has been dismissed by her husband commits adultery when she marries again, or a man who has been renounced by his wife." (Lowrie is speaking of Mark 10:2-12 only here, p. 139). "There is no evidence that a rabbi was capable of making a discrimination between the weightier matters of the law and the minutiae" (p. 178). No one but Jesus had been able to discover in Ps. 110:1,2 a reference to the Messiah (p. 100).

We also call attention to accidental errors as follows: the wrong aphorism of Jesus is given on page 133, line 6; the parable of the Good Samaritan is assigned to Matthew, page 125, line 20; "unlike" for "like," page 188, line 4.

AMOS N. WILDER

Chicago Theological Seminary

Contemporary Thinking About Jesus. By THOMAS E. KEPLER. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. 429 pages. \$3.50.

In this book are assembled samples, each a chapter from some book or an article from some journal, of the writings of 55 different authors. A "Biographical Index of Authors" gives a valuable Who's-who account of each of them. An appended "Bibliography" lists 133 titles by 127 authors. Those who have written upon Jesus, but do not rate listing in the bibliography, feel duly humble.

The book has the merits and defects which pertain to an anthology. Prof. Kepler has forestalled criticism as to the selection of these 55 to the exclusion of others by his prefatory explanation that it was due to space limitation and the need for presenting the principal varieties of interpretation. The omission of A. T. Olmstead, however, is really surprising.

The material is arranged in five parts:—
 (i) The Nature of the Synoptic Gospels;
 (ii) The Portrait of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel; (iii) Jesus' Relationship to History; (iv) Eschatology and Ethics; (v) Modern Evaluations of Jesus. The omission of Prof. Olmstead from part ii or part iii leaves out a phase of contemporary thinking which this reviewer did not find adequately covered in the material actually included in those parts, which is not to be construed that the reviewer endorses Olmstead's view.

The one most certain fact that we know about Jesus is that he was a teacher. The interpretation of Jesus as a teacher is the one aspect of the matter which this reviewer found least satisfactorily presented in the material included in this anthology. Perhaps no one will ever be satisfied with any (except one's own) treatment of eschatology, but one wonders if there are not authors who have done a better job of interpreting the place of eschatology in the

world-view of Jesus than is done in the material of part iv.

It is a valuable book to have at hand because it brings into juxtaposition the pros and cons on so many points of interpretation. It can furnish material for student collateral reading, class reports, and discussions.

At our annual NABI meeting last December, Dr. Brightman commented on a defect which mars the generality of writing on religion, and that is poor English style. One sees that in the material here assembled. Much of it is heavy going. This reviewer found a couple of oases, samples of winsome, convincing, and withal technically nice style, without being journalistic.

Prof. Kepler contributed to the February 1944 issue of this Journal (pages 12-16) an article entitled "The Dilemma Regarding Jesus," a rereading of which is recommended. It presents samplings from this book and makes clear the problem posed by the diverse interpretations.

I came to the end of the book feeling what a confusion there is about Jesus, and what a pity that it is so.

ELMER W. K. MOULD

Elmira College.

Biography

A Short Life of Kierkegaard. By WALTER LOWRIE. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1942. 271 pages. \$2.75.

"I became a great enigma (quaestio) to myself." In these terms Augustine described his own experience. One might turn this statement about and apply it to Kierkegaard. Until very recently, at least, this "gloomy Date" has been a veritable question-mark to English and American readers. We are largely indebted to Walter Lowrie for the fact that it is now possible for English-using readers to know Kierkegaard better. In an appendix at the back

of this book is given a list of Kierkegaard's Works in English. It is noteworthy that the earliest date on any of these translations is 1936 and that more than half of them have been published since 1940. Dr. Lowrie himself is responsible in whole or part for the translation of nineteen of these works. The Oxford and Princeton presses have led in publication.

Another reason for the difficulty in understanding Kierkegaard, in addition to the inaccessibility of his writings to English and American readers, is the fact that he chose what he described as the "indirect" method of communication, ascribing his works to such pseudonymous authors or editors as Victor Eremita, Constantine Constantius, et al. Fortunately, in his later period beginning with the years 1849-51, Kierkegaard used the direct method of communication so far as indicating authorship was concerned and also stated his aim explicitly. It was his "one thesis" in these writings that "Christianity no longer exists" and it was his one aim to rescue Christianity from the mediocrity into which he considered that it had fallen, with particular reference to the Established Church of Denmark, but with implications for Christianity in general wherever it had settled down in contentment with a diluted form of Christian teaching and practice. The documents containing this attack upon established Christianity were the last things S. K. wrote but were the first to be translated into German and Italian, being used for anti-clerical purposes. It is the only important part of Kierkegaard's writing that now remains to be translated into English and it should be made available to English readers but for a very different reason from that which moved the German and Italian translators. As Lowrie explains, "It must be made known, for it is a godly satire, and it is important that the clergy at least should hear it. A godly satire—for on his deathbed S. K. said to his old friend Pastor

Boesen, 'You must note that I have seen from the very inside of Christianity.' It is the only notable satire upon the Church which was not written by an outsider and an opponent" (p. 239).

The story of Kierkegaard's relationship to his father and of the tragic introversion which resulted largely from this must be studied in greater detail than is permitted within the limits of this review. The story has in it the elements of Greek tragedy and indeed Kierkegaard used the very language of Greek tragedy to describe his experience in what he thought would be sufficiently veiled language but which Dr. Lowrie is able to interpret in such a way as to make the inner conflict of Kierkegaard much more understandable.

This is a most helpful book for those who would understand a writer whose influence on present-day religious thought is marked.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Confessions of St. Augustine. Translated by F. J. SHEED. New York: Sheed & Ward, Inc., 1943. 354 pages. \$3.00.

The reviewer has re-read Augustine's *Confessions* in this new, vernacular translation and has had somewhat the same experience as that of about ten years ago in reading Pusey's translation from beginning to end. The experience may be likened to that of a traveler in the desert who endures the tedium of thirsty mile upon mile, buoyed up by the memory of the clear water of springs found earlier on the trail and the expectation of similar sources of revivification at future stages of the journey. Not all of Augustine's *Confessions* is exciting reading. Far from it. The modern reader does not like to read books so largely interspersed with quotations as the *Confessions* is with long passages from the Bible. Then, too, the twentieth century reader, excepting the scholar, is not equip-

ped to appreciate the technical discussions of Manichaeism, Neo-platonism, and the other *isms* of the fourth century A. D. Moreover, Latin, with its awkward, periodic sentences, lacks the literary grace of the more flexible Greek, and it is through the medium of North African Latin that Augustine has to express himself. Yet there is not a chapter of the *Confessions* in which the writer has not found one or more passages which he has wanted to underline so that he might find them the more easily the next time. The famous line which occurs almost at the beginning of the first book and which provides the theme for the *Confessions* as a whole is worth the price of the entire volume: "For Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." And so it goes until one reaches the climax of the autobiographical portion of the book in chapter ten which is a veritable gold-mine of quotable passages. In order to indicate the comparative value of the Sheed translation, the reviewer will quote a single passage from Chapter Ten, giving both the Sheed and the Pusey renderings:

"Late have I loved Thee, O Beauty so ancient and so new; late have I loved Thee! For behold Thou wert within me, and I outside; and I sought Thee outside and in my unloveliness fell upon those lovely things that Thou hast made. Thou wert with me and I was not with Thee. I was kept from Thee by those things, yet had they not been in Thee, they would not have been at all. Thou didst call and cry to me and break open my deafness: and Thou didst send forth Thy beams and shine upon me and chase away my blindness: Thou didst breathe fragrance upon me, and I drew in my breath and do now pant for Thee: I tasted Thee, and now hunger and thirst for Thee: Thou didst touch me, and I have burned for Thy peace." (Sheed).

"Too late" loved I Thee, O Thou Beauty of ancient days, yet ever new! too late I loved Thee! And behold, Thou wert within, and I abroad, and there I searched for Thee; deformed I, plunging amid those fair forms, which Thou hadst made. Thou wert with me, but I was not with Thee. Things held me far from Thee, which, unless they were in Thee, were not at all. Thou calledst,

and shoutedst, and burstest, my deafness. Thou flashedt, shonest, and scatterdst my blindness. Thou breathedst odours, and I drew in breath and pant for Thee. I tasted, and hunger and thirst. Thou touchdest me, and I burned for Thy peace' (Pusey).

In this passage the Pusey translation may seem to have the advantage of the newer and this is true in some of the other well-known and often-quoted sections of the *Confessions*. Nevertheless, the Sheed translation renders a valuable service in bringing Augustine to us in twentieth-century language. He seems more like one of us, and is more intelligible for that reason. Just as we should be glad to have the Goodspeed and Moffatt and other modern translations of the Bible along with the King James, so we may be happy to have this new and fresh rendering of the *Confessions of Saint Augustine* along with the Pusey and other earlier versions.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Devotional Life

On Beginning from Within. By DOUGLAS V. STEERE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943. 149 pages. \$1.50.

There are many evidences today that religion is regaining its self confidence. Its apologetic is not derivative, but original and self dependent.

As the title would indicate, Steere argues for the validity of the inner, spiritual authority and life. In the preface, he sounds a little angry in his protest against collectivistic thought in theology, and insists upon the freedom of the saint. The spiritual person challenges any society at its "vulnerable center," at that place where its basic purposes or dreams are hid. He dares to do so, because of insight which is *sui generis*, and to which he is committed regardless of social structure or consequences. This book is a plea for the re-discovery and personal appropriation of this experience. To make this possible, a new set of devotional exer-

cises must be developed, and Steere outlines several of the methods which must be included. From this spiritual experience an adequate theology also will emerge, because, as the author argues, theology flows from spiritual exercise. Often, in religious thinking, the process is reversed.

The final chapter of the book is the Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality. Its pertinence to the thought of the book is seen in the proposal that death illuminates the deeper meanings of life, which also are met in the devotional life.

This is a stirring book. Steere has a gift for moving illustrations, and in his words there is the power of the man who knows personally that of which he speaks. This is able scholarship coupled with fervent concern.

ELMER E. VOEKEL

*First Congregational Church
Beloit, Wisc.*

History of Religions

Sacred Writings of the World's Great Religions. Selected and edited by S. E. FROST, Jr., B. D., Ph. D. New York: The New Home Library, 1943. 410 pages. 69 cents.

Every decade brings more urgently the necessity that educated persons shall know something about religions other than their own and about their sacred writings. Several books of selections are already available, but for the most part they were not arranged very suitably for use by the average student or general reader. But here, from an unexpected publisher, comes just the answer to this need. In a well-made volume, at a mass-production price, are offered well-chosen selections from the sacred writings of the eleven main living religions. And, for good measure, selections are included from the Mormon literature and from Christian Science.

All the religions originating in India are represented. For Hinduism, about thirty

pages are chosen from the Rig Veda, from five Upanishads, and the Bhagavad Gita. For Buddhism, twenty pages are selected, including much of the Dhammapada. Ten pages each are given to samples from the scriptures of Jainism and of Sikhism. For Confucianism twenty-six pages are given, including much of the Analects and of Mencius. Taoism is represented by parts of the Tao Teh King; and Shinto by short parts of the Kojiki, etc. Zoroastrianism gets two selections. Mohammedanism is given about forty pages, Mormonism and Christian Science are sampled. And generous selections are made for Judaism (including the Apocrypha), and for Christianity.

Each religion is given a compact introduction. The readings are arranged by verse, paragraph, and title, making them easily accessible. A useful appendix includes about thirty main topics, with the relevant verses quoted from the several religions. Altogether, this is a timely and useful volume. The fact that it is so inexpensive and that it is distributed through the widespread Woolworth stores makes it easily gettable by the many persons who should own and read it.

HORACE T. HOUF

Ohio University

Archaeology

The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim. Vol. III: The Iron Age. By W. F. ALBRIGHT. (Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, XXI-XXII) New Haven, 1943. xxvi+229 pages, 73 plates. \$4.00.

This is the final volume reporting the excavations conducted at Tell Beit Mirsim (probably Biblical Kirjath-sepher or Debir) between 1926 and 1932. It should be of special interest to students of the Old Testament because it covers the history of this town from the time of the Hebrew conquest to the Babylonian exile. While the excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim was "modest in

its yield of museum pieces [and] chary of inscriptions," it was nevertheless a very rewarding project, because of the fairly clear stratification of the site and the unrivalled competence of its direction.

This report includes discussion of the two upper strata of the Iron Age, A and B. The B stratum is subdivided into three periods: the first extends from the Hebrew conquest in the latter half of the thirteenth century to the Philistine invasion, cir. 1150 B. C.; the second covers the era of Philistine domination; the third begins with the time when David took the city and built the first Iron Age wall on the site, and closes with the destruction by Shishak, dated by Albright in 918 B. C. The topmost stratum cannot be clearly subdivided throughout, but Albright believes the city suffered severely under the invasion of Sennacherib in 701. Tell Beit Mirsim reached the zenith of its economic prosperity in the eighth century B. C., and throughout the last half of its Iron Age history was a center for the manufacture of textile goods, as shown by the discovery of many dye-plants, loom-weights, and similar appurtenances of this industry.

This site has been especially fruitful in its yield of fertility figurines and of well-preserved remains of private-house plans. The excavators uncovered many objects of everyday use which help to make vivid the life in an ancient Biblical city: plow-tips, ox-goad points, cosmetic palettes, children's rattles, weights, and the like. Albright has expressed in this volume his final opinion on many debated archaeological problems raised by the excavation of the site, and has included a large amount of comparative material from other sites. Among other things, he has shown that the ancient "shekel" weighed approximately 11.4 grams, and that the "bath" held 22 liters.

The fourth chapter is an unusually instructive study of the potter's technique at

Tell Beit Mirsim, especially for Stratum A. It is unique in archaeological literature in that it is the result of the collaboration of a Palestinian archaeologist, J. L. Kelso of Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, and a professor of ceramics in the University of Pittsburgh, J. P. Thorley. They have demonstrated that the ancient Israelite potters had considerable artistic skill, but point out that in a number of important respects the finest pottery was produced by pre-Israelite Canaanites in the Middle Bronze Age.

The careful reader of this book will gain many interesting insights into Old Testament history and ancient Hebrew life.

J. PHILIP HYATT

*School of Religion,
Vanderbilt University.*

Miscellaneous

The People of the Book. By SAMUEL ROSENBLATT. New York: Behrman's Jewish Book House, 1943. 149 pages. \$2.50.

The author, an Arabist as well as a rabbi, takes his title from the well-known expression in the Koran. His purpose seems to be to give informal impressions of his idea of the Jewish people and their history. Rabbi Rosenblatt is a political Zionist of the Mizrachi type, and this point of view dominates much of the small volume. He wishes "an independent Jewish state on the soil of Palestine" (p. 47), and speaks of Judaism as a "national religion" (p. 9) and "more than a religious sect" (p. 8). He refers several times to the Jews as a "race" (pp. 28, 63, 108), although he admits, and indeed pleads, that there is no way of telling a Jew from a Gentile by physical test (pp. 3, 5). Religion and nationalism are both essential factors of Judaism, he says. The author insists that this does not conflict with patriotic citizenship in, let us say, the U. S. A. But he says nothing about the principle of the separation of church and

state, and it is not surprising that later on he says that "democracy, too, interferes with the normal functioning of Jewish life wherever Jews constitute . . . a minority" (p. 33).

Dr. Rosenblatt has a deep appreciation of the prophetic ethics of the Old Testament and the significance of the Bible in our modern culture. But, like Joseph Klausner and others before him, he tends to portray Judaism as "chiefly this-worldly" and Christianity as "primarily other-worldly." He boasts, e. g. that hardly any Jewish congregation will tolerate an unmarried rabbi. This attitude betrays a lamentable ignorance of modern Protestantism and especially such phases of it as the Social Gospel movement.

The book closes with essays on Rabbi Akiba, Moses Maimonides, Rashi, and Yehuda Halevy. Here the author is at his best, and the accounts of these great figures make most interesting and informative reading. There are also several good sections on the relations between Judaism and Islam through the ages.

W. F. STINESPRING
Duke University

The War Against God.—Edited and with an introduction by CARL CARMER. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1943, pp. xiv, 261, \$2.75.

The purpose of this anthology is to awaken all Christendom to the fact that the war is basically a death-grapple between Christ and Antichrist, and in view of our enemies' deliberate and avowed attempt to annihilate the Christian religion, to impress upon Christians and the Christian Church the obligation, at the least as a survival measure, to throw themselves without reserve into the total battle against its declared opponents. Its various authors therefore show no patience with pacifists. Our enemies anticipated us in their diagnosis of

Christianity as the pivotal issue around which the whole war revolves. Having perused the Axis powers' actual statements of their purpose to destroy an incompatible Christianity, declarations amply submitted and also heading each chapter, the layman-compiler, veteran of World-War I, looked for the reactions which Christians were making to the threat. The book testifies to a corresponding (if somewhat belated) recognition of the centrality of Christianity in the war on the part of Christians. The greater part of the volume is devoted to the "answers" which seemed to the editor the most logical and the most moving. Despite inevitable individual variations, the degree of unanimity manifest on the different aspects of the situation is reassuring, and the whole constitutes perhaps as near an approach to the contemporary voice of the Christian conscience aroused to answer a fateful challenge as could be expected. Typical of this is the affirmation of Robert Bellaire, p. 59, "Never in the 2,000-year history of the Christian Church have Christians been in such deadly peril, both from the East and the West." The book as a whole sees the war as the price we now pay for our failure to be Christian. "Because we could not outlive and outargue the enemy, we now have to outgun, outtank,

and outplane him," John W. Bradford, p. 236.

Other answerers to the challenge include President Roosevelt, Vice-president Wallace, Viscount Halifax, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Denis Cardinal Dougherty, Metropolitan Sergius of the Russian Orthodox Church, President H. S. Coffin, John Bennett, Bishop Manning, Sherwood Eddy, H. A. Atkinson, Lynn H. Hough, Pearl Buck, W. R. Benét and Sir Stafford Cripps, who sets before all Christians a forced option, "Either the Christianity in which we believe is no more than the whitened sepulchre of the Pharisees, or else it is the most real thing in our lives," p. 207.

The volume closes with a presentation of the Christian moral and spiritual foundations indispensable for a Better World (Part V). An alarming book, but not alarmist. If all other means have failed, it may be that the actuality of the horrible alternatives to Christianity, already exhibited in the incipient realization of un- and anti-Christian totalitarian, political religions will avail to scare even a "sophisticated," neo-pagan generation into a due appreciation of and dedication to that common Christian heritage to which we owe the best that we sometimes are and have.

PAUL F. LAUBENSTEIN
Connecticut College.

The Resurrection of Jesus

by S. Vernon McCasland

Professor of Religion in the University of Virginia

Published 1932; first extensive American use of form criticism; Luke 24:34—"The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon"—recognized as earliest surviving form of the resurrection story; development of Gospel accounts traced from that nucleus.

"It will take an outstanding place"—E. F. Scott.

"Excellent and penetrating"—Morton S. Enslin.

"Mancherlei Neues und so noch nicht Gesehenes"—Georg Bertram.

Only remaining copies now available from the Author, 1852 Winston Ave., Charlottesville, Va. \$2.00

May
d, p.
clude
Wal-
iang
Met-
odox
Ben-
, H.
Buck,
who
tion,
be-
chre
real

on of
nada-
world
not
d, it
ible
ex-
un-
reli-
stisti-
ap-
om-
the

Stimulating,

Worthwhile New Books

THE VITALITY OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Edited by GEORGE F. THOMAS

In collaboration with eleven American teachers of religion

"I must herald its importance from the housetops! It is not a mere collection of disparate articles written by individual thinkers. It is the fruit of collective thinking by a group of Christian scholars who share so nearly the same point of view that the writer of any chapter might have written all the other chapters, save for the fact that each writer brings to his part of the task a highly specialized knowledge."—Charles Clayton Morrison.

\$3.00

A PREFACE TO PRAYER

By GERALD HEARD

Mr. Heard believes that prayer is not opposed to analytical thought, but is complementary to such thought, that prayer has a social value, integrating the individual with himself, with society and with the universe; that prayer provides the basic philosophy of our society with new, progressive, comprehensive ideals and principles, without which society will die; that prayer is the way, and the only way, in which man's evolution can be continued. Such points are brilliantly argued. The concluding sections provide specific suggestions and techniques that will prove effective. \$2.00

FROM SCIENCE TO GOD

By KARL SCHMIDT

Here is a solid contribution to the problems of the relationship of science and theology. Professor Schmidt speaks directly to two groups: those who are alienated from religion and ignore it because of its conflict with science, and those who maintain that religion must be divested of all dogma and theology. The author argues that theology must be autonomous. He holds that religion, in relying on science—physics, psychology and ethics—for its principles, is seeking false support, for science has no need for God. The author is Professor of Philosophy, Carleton College. \$2.00

THE GREAT CENTURY

North Africa and Asia

By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

"Probably the greatest service of Christian scholarship to these times, and one of the most valuable in the history of the Church, is being rendered by Professor Latourette in his monumental history."—Henry Pitney Van Dusen. In Volume VI Professor Latourette concludes his survey of the Great Century (1800-1914 A. D.). Nowhere else has the entire 19th century spread of Christianity in Northern Africa and Asia been brought together. \$4.00

HARPER & BROTHERS, Publishers

49 East 33rd Street

New York 16, N. Y.

BOOK NOTICES

Choose Ye This Day. A Study of Decision and Commitment in Christian Personality. By ELMER G. HOMRIGHAUSEN. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943. 152 pages. \$1.50.

"By the grace of God we must work to bring about realistic meetings between God in Christ and men. This is the task of teacher, evangelist, preacher, parent, and writer of Christian literature." This is the central conviction around which the author writes this "statement on evangelism." The book issued from a concern of the Department of Evangelism of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Faced with a failure of the Church to grip this generation with the appeal of the Gospel, a Committee was appointed to study the whole subject of Christian decision and commitment, with a view to meeting this situation.

The treatment is of primary interest to the parish minister, but it provides some food for searching thought by all who bear responsibility for "laying the claim of the Gospel on the individual." Stress is largely upon reaching the individual through an intelligent, vital and relevant approach, but there is at least parenthetical recognition of the importance of the social nature and appeal of the Gospel. The old type of evangelism (revivalism) is of course repudiated, but an insistent plea is made for definite "conversion evidence,"—indeed, "only those should be admitted to Church membership who show definite signs of having had an experience with Christ."

Certain "liberal" and "naturalistic" emphases are decried as detracting from the centrality and authority of Jesus Christ as the revelation of God, such as: the demeaning of Christianity by studying it as simply one of the religions; the tendency to "substitute religious education for evangelism, i. e. the placing of too much confidence in gradual nurture and ignoring the necessity of personal encounter with God in Christ;" the "stressing of the religion of Jesus (his religiousness) as against the religion *about* Jesus;" the conception of "revelation in terms (only) of human quest and discovery."

Concerning the Bible, the point of view is indicated by such passages as: "The Old Testament is the framework of the New . . . many things in the Old Testament are the foundations of the New, such as the account of the Creation, of the Fall of man . . . Jesus Christ is the subject of the whole Bible, and of both Testaments."

The book is, on the whole, a forthright discussion of a real problem confronting ministers and religious educators, and reveals the author's, and presumably the Federal Council Committee's deep concern to help find a more effective way to foster decision and commitment which shall be both "true to the faith and relevant to life."

JOHN W. FLIGHT

Haverford College

Religious Counseling of College Students. By THORNTON W. MERRIAM. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1943. 80 pages. Paper-bound, 50c.

This work presents "the principles, procedures, and distinctive characteristics of religious counseling as an educational method" and does it in a way that is brief, readable, and sound. It likewise is rendered highly practical by the case study method. The pattern described is essentially that of good counseling in general and this book should be put into the hands of every teacher or administrative officer who pretends to exercise any counseling function.

The latter half of the book is devoted to an excellent review of the difficulties presented by the modern organization and procedures in higher education and an argument for the responsibility of colleges. The authors outline a constructive program for the college, and they summarize the significant changes in higher education and the recent developments in religious thought in a manner which every educator will appreciate.

ALBION ROY KING

Cornell College

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Histomap of Religion. By JOHN B. SPARKS.

Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1943. Foreword, 5 pages + colored map, 22 in. x 58 in. \$1.00.

By tracing the origins of religion back as far as 160,000 years ago this map with its delineation of various cultures shows the growth of Magic and Fetishism, Tabu and Totemism, Ancestor Worship, Tribal Gods and Divine Kings, Propitiation of Nature Spirits, and Fertility Cults. It portrays the evolution of these roots up to the present day, where it is possible; or shows where tangent world religions come into their genesis. Prepared by an engineer, but carefully checked by a scholar in the history of religions, Professor Horace L. Friess, it makes an excellent chart to have on the study wall where at a glance one can observe the story of religion. It is a companion to Mr. Sparks' two other maps, *The Histomap of World History* (1931) and *The Histomap of Evolution* (1932).

THOMAS S. KEPLER

Lawrence College

In the Steps of Moses. By LOUIS GOLDING. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1943. vi - 556 pages. 16 full-page illustrations and 2 end maps. \$2.50.

War-time Teaching

(Concluded from page 82)

a large part of their time to this urgent task of campus religious leadership. Why not develop during this emergency a plan of long-range significance, closely correlated with the teaching program, which gives to the leadership of chapel, voluntary religious program, and religious counseling the same dignity which we have associated with classroom teaching? At any rate we dare not give less than our best now in leadership to the boys in the military units on our campuses.

It is the task of our colleges, and especially the church-related colleges, to keep the flame of religion burning brightly during these dark days. This flame does not need sheltering. It only needs to be held high.

Louis Golding will be remembered by many as the author of *Mr. Emmanuel*, one of the most poignant novels to come out of World War II and its persecution of racial minorities. Here the English novelist explores the spiritual history of his race by re-tracing the steps of Moses and giving fresh expression to the meaning of those events which lie at the beginning of Jewish religious life and which are of nearly equal interest to Christians as well.

The Changing Reputation of Human Nature. By

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS. Reprinted in slightly revised form from *The Journal of Liberal Religion*. Chicago: 5701 Woodlawn Ave., 1943. 48 pages. 25c.

Freedom Speaks. Ideals of Democracy in Poetry and Prose. Selected by GEORGE F. REYNOLDS and DONALD F. CONNORS. Sponsored by the College English Association. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1943. 270 pages. \$2.00.

The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons, 1944. By EARL L. DOUGLASS, D. D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. 385 pages. \$1.50.

For no wind can put it out, nor can the darkness overwhelm it.

Religious Educator

(Concluded from page 86)

religious leadership. Whither are we going? Who values and follows our leadership? Is there a better way for specialists to co-operate? Shall we seek to identify the results of religion in the progress of mankind through the centuries and shall we work more intelligently in the many places where religious qualities show encouraging growth? Shall we follow the example of him who refused to be bound by "Ye have heard it said of old time," and whose vision of "greater things" did not make him fearful of leaving the old to achieve the new?

THE ASSOCIATION

The Chicago Meeting

The Mid-Western branch of N.A.B.I. held its 1944 meeting on January 14 and 15 at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

The program was as follows:

Friday, January 14, 8:00 P. M.

President's Address—"Teaching Undergraduates"

Prof. E. E. Domm, North Central College
"Paul through Jewish Eyes," an appraisal of Klausner's,

From Jesus to Paul and Asch's, The Apostle
Prof. Amos N. Wilder, Chicago Theological Seminary

Discussion

Saturday, January 15, 9:30 A. M.

Business session

Symposium: Pre-theological Training of Ministerial Candidates

Prof. Raymond A. Brewer,
James Miliken University

Prof. Thomas S. Kepler, Lawrence College
Discussion leader, Dean E. R. Colwell, University of Chicago

"The Sociological Approach to the Bible"

Prof. Herbert May, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology

"An Aesthetic Approach to Religion"

Prof. Floyd L. Sampson, University of Denver

Saturday, 2:00 P. M.

"Recent College Graduates Look at the Department of Religion."

Prof. Charles A. Kraft, Albion College

"Ten Years of *The Journal of Bible and Religion*"

Prof. Louise Eby, Milwaukee-Downer College

3:15 P. M.

Symposium arranged by the Chicago Society of Biblical Research and certain members of the International Council of Religious Education.

"Has the Biblical Scholar Failed the Religious Educator?"

Prof. Ernest J. Chave, University of Chicago
"Has the Religious Educator Neglected the Bible?"

Prof. Floyd V. Filson, Presbyterian Theological Seminary

"Have the Specialists Failed the Pastor?"

Dr. George M. Gibson, Pastor Hyde Park United Church, Chicago

Discussion

6:30 P. M.

Joint Dinner of the Societies

"Centennial of the Birth of Wellhausen: His Continuing Significance"

Prof. W. A. Irwin, University of Chicago,
and President of The Chicago Society
of Biblical Research

Adjournment

Officers elected were:

President, T. P. Stephens, Aurora College, Aurora, Illinois; Vice-President, E. C. Colwell, University of Chicago, Chicago; Secretary, W. E. Hunter, 214 W. 52nd Street, Chicago.

Associates in Council: For 3 years, E. E. Domm, North Central College, class of 1947; for 2 years, T. S. Kepler, Lawrence College, class of 1946; for 1 year, R. R. Brewer, Millikin University, class of 1945.

Executive Committee: The officers and the associates in Council.

Committee on Program for 1945 Meeting: Carl E. Purinton, chairman.

Submitted,
WILLIAM E. HUNTER

Personnel

Readers of the Journal may appropriately bring to the attention of college and university officials the following list of teachers of religion who are available for positions. (This does not mean that they are at present unemployed.)

Letters should be addressed to Dr. Eugene S. Ashton, Chairman, Committee on Vacancies, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland, who will forward all communications to the appropriate code number, thus serving to bring the institutions and the candidates in touch with each other without the responsibility of making recommendations or selections.

Information concerning possible vacancies should also be sent to Dr. Ashton.

A listing of all those enrolled this year was sent to the deans of instruction of more than 350 colleges and junior colleges which offer courses in Bible or Religion.

B-1—Man; A. B. (Lang.), Findlay College; Th. B. & Th. M. (N. T.), Princeton; Ph. D., (N. T.), U. of Edin. 13 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, minister. Desired subj.; N. T. Grk., O T & N. T. Can also teach: Classical Lang., Theol., Homiletics.

B-2—Man; A. B. (Anthrop.), U. of Penn.; B. D. (O. T.), Union Sem.; S. T. M. (O T.), Harvard; Ph. D. (Bib. Lit.), Brown. 2 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, minister. Desired subj.: O. T., Bib. Lit. & Hist. of Near East, Archeol., and Lang. Can also teach: N. T. Grk., Hebrew, Semitics, and Hist. of Rel.

C-3—Man; A. B. (Classics), Grinnell; B. D. (Theol.), Oberlin Sem.; S. T. M. & Th. D. (Phil. of Rel.), Union Sem. & Columbia U. 26 yrs. teach. exper. Now head of dept. of rel. in mid-Western co-ed college. Desired subj.: Phil. of Rel., World Rel., Current Prob. of Christian Thinking, Ethics, Phil., Bib. Lt. Can also teach: European Intellectual Hist., Chinese Thought and Culture, Chinese, N. T. Grk.

E-1—Woman; A. B. (Hist. & Rel.), Mt. Holyoke; B. D. (O. T.), Union Sem.; 2 yrs. grad. work, U. of Marburg; Ph. D. (Phil., Rel.), U. of Edinburgh. 13 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, teacher. Desired subj.; Bib. Lit., Phil. of Rel., Hist. of Rel., Psych. of Rel., Theol., Rel. Educ. Can also teach: Phil; Logic, Ethics, Eng-Comp.

H-1—Man; A. B. (Greek) Duke U.; M. A., B. D. (N. T.), Duke U.; S.T.M., Harvard; Ph. D. (N.T.), Brown U. 4 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, teacher. Desired subj.: N. T. Bible, Church Hist., Hist. of Rel. Can also teach; Contemp. Rel. Problems, Rel. Educ.

L-1—Woman; B. S. (Math.), Monmouth College; Th. M. (Theol.), & Th. D. (Rel. Educ.), Iliff Sch. of Theol.; M A. (Psych.), U. of Denver; grad. work at Columbia and Union Sem. 5 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, teacher. Desired subj.: Bible, Rel. Educ. Can also teach: Math., Psych., Hygiene.

M-5—Woman; A. B. (Psych.), U. of Rochester; M.A. (Educ.), Hartford Sem.; 1 yr. grad. work (China & India), Hartford Sem.,

Present position, Director of R.E. Desired subj.: World Rel., Personal Rel. Living, Bible, Teachings of Jesus, Psych.

M-7—Woman; A. B. (Rel.), Vassar; B. D. (Bible), Union Sem.; Present position, religious educator. Desired subj.: Bible, Life of Jesus, Rel. Educ. Can also teach: Comparative Rel.

M-8—Man; Ph. B. (Rel. & Phil.) Brown U.; B. D. (N. T.), Andover Newton; Th. D. (N. T.), Boston U. Theol. Sem. Present Position, minister. Desired subj.: N. T., O. T., Phil. of Rel., Church Hist., Comp. Rel. Can also teach: N. T. Greek, Phil., Psych. of Rel.

N-1—Man; A. B. Cum laude, (Hist.) Maryville; Th. B. & Th. M. (Christ. Educ.), Princeton. Thesis in preparation for M. A. in Hist., U. of Pittsburgh. Present position, minister. Desired subj.: English Bible, Rel. Christian Educ. Can also teach: Hist., Phil.

O-1—Woman; A. B. (Hist.), U. of Richmond; B. D. (Bib. Lit. & Exeg.), Crozer Theol. Sem. Present position, College Y. M. C. A. Secret. Desired subj.: N. T. & O. T. Hist. & Lit.; Hist. of Rel. Can also teach: Christian Ethics and Morals. Hist., Soc., Psych.

S-3—Man A. B. (Lat. & Eng.), Western Reserve U.; S. T. B., M. A., & Ph. D., (N. T.), Boston U. Grad. fellowship for study at Berlin & Heidelberg. 6 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, minister. Desired subj.: N. T. or O. T. Can also teach: Church Hist., Phil., Phil. of Rel., Ethics.

T-1—Man; A. B. (Rel.), U. of S. Calif.; B. D. (Bible), & Ph. D. (O. T.), Yale Div. Sch. Present position, minister. Desired subj.: O. T., N. T., Bib., Archeol. Can also teach: N. T. Greek, Hebrew, Ancient Hist., Comp. Rel.

W-3—Man; Attended U. of Mich.; Ph. B. (Classics), M. A. (N. T.), & Ph. D. (O. T.), U. of Chicago; B. D. (Bible), Chicago Theol. Sem. Holds certificate for 1 yr. of work in Palestinian Hist. at Am. Sch. of Orient. Research. 9 yrs. teach. exper. Present position, business. Desired subj.: Bible, Phil. of Rel., Church Hist. Can also teach: Rel. Educ., Comp. Rel., Grk.

Members of the Association, 1943-1944

A.

Mr. John Vincent Abbott, P. O. Box 3, Watertown, Conn.
 Prof. David E. Adams B. D., D. D., (Mount Holyoke College), Box 42, South Hadley, Mass.
 Dean Carl Agee, B. D., D. D., Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Dean Alvin A. Ahern, S. T. D., M. A., Greenville College, Greenville, Ill.
 Prof. William F. Albright, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Prof. Sylvia E. Aldrich, Hadley, Mich.
 Dean Leroy Allen, A. M., D. Soc. Sc., (Southwestern College), 1414 East Fourth Ave., Winfield, Kan.
 Prof. May A. Allen, Ph. D., Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.
 Mr. Bernhard W. Anderson, B. D., Box 11, Waukegan, Conn.
 Prof. John L. Anderson, College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho.
 Prof. M. L. Andreasen, S. D. A., Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.
 Prof. Mary E. Andrews, Ph. D., (Goucher College) 4305 Wickford Rd., Baltimore, Md.
 Dr. Eugene S. Ashton, Th. D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
 Prof. A. L. Aulick, Th. D., (Oklahoma Baptist University), 1424 North Park, Shawnee, Okla.
 Prof. William Goodwin Aurelio, (Boston University) 5 Euston St., Brookline, Mass.
 Prof. Burt Wilmet Ayres, Ph. D., Taylor University, Upland, Ind.

B.

Prof. Albert E. Bailey, A. M., 21 Saxon Rd., Worcester, Mass.
 Prof. John W. Bailey, Ph. D., (Berkley Baptist Divinity School) 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Cal.
 Miss M. Marguerite Bailey, Vienna, Va.
 Rev. Smoot Baker, First Baptist Church, Spencer, N. C.
 Prof. J. F. Balzer, A. M., Doane College, Crete, Neb.
 Rev. J. B. Barber, Th. M., D. D., Lincoln University, Chester Co., Pa.
 Prof. Albert E. Barnett, Ph. D., c/o Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Dean Harold G. Barr, B. D., (Kansas Bible College), 1300 Oread, Lawrence, Kan.

Louise Littleton Bashford, M. A., 516 Polk St., Raleigh, N. C.
 Prof. Edna M. Baxter, A. M., (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 55 Elisabeth St., Hartford, Conn.
 Chaplain Stephen F. Bayne Jr., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, Ph. D., (Syracuse University), 920 Lancaster Ave., Syracuse, 10, N. Y.
 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Ph. D., Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
 Prof. Marion J. Benedict, Ph. D., Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
 Prof. W. A. Benfield Jr., Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 109 East Broadway, Louisville, 2, Ky.
 Prof. John C. Bennett, 3041 Broadway, New York, 27, N. Y.
 Prof. William H. Bernhardt, Ph. D., The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Col.
 Miss Evelyn Berry, A. M., Paine College, Augusta, Ga.
 Dr. George R. Berry, Ph. D., D. D., 2 Prescott St., Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. William E. Berry, Ph. D., Earlham College, Earlham, Ind.
 Prof. Peter A. Bertocci, Ph. D., (Bates College), 23 Googin St., Lewiston, Me.
 Dr. Edward Blair, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
 Prof. McKendree M. Blair, S. T. B., (MacMurray College), 629 Hardin Ave., Jacksonville, Ill.
 Mr. E. W. Blakeman, (University of Michigan) Room 9, University Hall, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Prof. Charles M. Bond, A. M., D. D., (Bucknell University), 309 South Sixth St., Lewisburg, Pa.
 Dr. F. W. A. Bosch, S. T. D., Westminster Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Mo.
 Prof. Charles S. Braden, Ph. D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Prof. J. E. Brakefield, Louisiana College, Pineville, La.
 Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Ph. D., Litt. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
 Prof. Fred G. Bratton, Ph. D., (Springfield College), 88 Fenwick St., Springfield, Mass.
 Prof. Herman A. Brautigam, Ph. D., (Colgate University), 116 Broad St., Hamilton, N. Y.
 Prof. Raymond R. Brewer, Ph. D., (James Milliken University), 412 N. Summit Ave., Decatur, Ill.

Prof. Edgar S. Brightman, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., (Boston University), Box 35, Newton Center, 59, Mass.

Prof. Beatrice Allard Brooks, Ph. D., Western College, Oxford, O.

Rev. Edwin C. Broome, Jr., Ph. D., 45 Horace Rd, Belmont, Mass.

Prof. Ralph C. Brown, S. T. B., D. D., (West Virginia Wesleyan College), 24 Central Ave., Buckhannon, W. Va.

Dean Elizabeth A. Brubaker, Tennessee Wesleyan Junior College, Athens, Tenn.

Prof. J. D. Buchanan, A. M., D. D., (Monmouth College), 1109 East Broadway, Monmouth, Ill.

Prof. John Russell Bucher, Ph. D., 1003 Logan St., McMechen, W. Va.

Prof. Henry M. Bullock, Ph. D., 714 N. Rankin, Natchez, Miss.

Prof. B. LeRoy Burkhart, Ph. D., The College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.

Prof. Millar Burrows, Ph. D., (Yale Divinity School), 409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn.

Rev. Alexander C. Bryans, First Methodist Church, Montrose, Colo.

C.

Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D., Litt. D., D. D. (Harvard University), 7 Buckingham Pl., Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Lyman V. Cady, Th. D., Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

Prof. Earle E. Cairns, Ph. D., 614 N. Washington, Wheaton, Ill.

Miss Grace E. Cairns, A. M., 5806 Harford Rd., Baltimore, Md.

Rev. Melvin Macye Cammack, A. M., 2526 Ohio St., Topeka, Kan.

Mr. Edgar M. Carlson, B. D., (Gustavus Adolphus College), 821 S. Fourth St., St. Peter, Minn.

Miss Florence E. Carman, A. M., (Baptist Missionary Training School), 2969 Vernon Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Wesley M. Carr, Th. D., Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn.

Prof. Samuel Moss Carter, B. D., Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

Prof. Samuel A. Cartledge, Ph. D., Columbia Seminary, Decatur, Ga.

Prof. Maynard L. Cassady, Ph. D., 3825 N. Fifth St., Arlington, Va.

Prof. W. G. Chanter, 12 Academy Rd., Madison, N. J.

Dr. Daryl Chase, Ph. D., L. D. S., Institute of Religion, Logan, Utah.

Chaplain C. A. Chazeaud, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

Rev. John L. Cheek, Ph. D., 9103 Sherman Ave., Brookfield, Ill.

Prof. Kenneth W. Clark, Ph. D., (Duke University), 4684 Duke Sta., Durham, N. C.

Chaplain Otha L. Clark, Florida Naval Academy, St. Augustine, Fla.

Prof. James W. Clarke, D. D., 855 Chalmers Pl., Chicago, 14, Ill.

Rev. Maurice Clarke, D. D., Rectory Square, Camden, S. C.

Rev. Fred B. Clausen, D. D., (Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada), 186 Albert St., Waterloo, Ont., Can.

Prof. James T. Cleland, S. T. M., The Choate School, Wallingford, Conn.

Prof. Frank W. Clelland, Ph. D., D. D., (Gammon Theological Seminary) 36 Gammon Ave., S. E., Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Eric L. Clitheroe, Ph. D., Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.

Prof. Russell J. Compton, Ph. D., (Hamline University), St. Paul, 4, Minn.

Rev. Ruth S. Conant, B. D., 196 Niles St., Hartford, Conn.

Prof. M. Stanley Congdon, (Burton College), Box 936, Binghamton, N. Y.

Rev. Francis T. Cooke, Ph. D., D. D., 31 Maple St., Bristol, Conn.

Rev. Isaac S. Corn, Ph. D., 105 North Fell Ave., Normal, Ill.

Prof. Virginia Corwin, Ph. D., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Prof. Solon B. Cousins, A. B., D. D., University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.

Prof. Clarence T. Craig, Ph. D., D. D., (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), 128 Forest St., Oberlin, O.

Prof. Leonidas W. Crawford, Ph. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.

Chaplain Harry P. C. Cressman, A. M., (Muhlenberg College), 1817 East Greenleaf St., Allentown, Pa.

Prof. Margaret B. Crook, A. B., (Smith College), 30 Washington Ave., Northampton, Mass.

Prof. Roger Cummings, Th. M., Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.

Prof. Merrimon Cunnigim, Ph. D., (Denison University), Box 715, Granville, O.

Prof. Muriel C. Curtis (Mrs. Edward E.), B. D., (Wellesley College), 60 Dover Rd., Wellesley, Mass.

D.

- Prof. George Dahl, Ph. D., (Yale Divinity School), 209 Livingston St., New Haven, Conn.
 Prof. Robert T. Daniel, Th. M., (Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary), Box 1354, Seminary Hill, Tex.
 Prof. Clara Willoughby Davidson, A. M., (Randolph-Macon Woman's College), 36 Watson Rd., Wellesley, Mass.
 Rev. John F. Davidson, A. M., (Upper Canada College), 322 Spadina Rd., Toronto 10, Ont., Can.
 Prin. Richard Davidson, Ph. D., D. D., Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ont., Can.
 Prin. Hester R. Davies, A. M., (Walnut Hill School), 12 Highland St., Natick, Mass.
 Prof. Paul E. Davies, Ph. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 844 Chalmers Pl., Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. Zachariah Davies, A. M., D. D., (Carroll College), 127 W. Newhall Ave., Waukesha, Wis.
 Prof. Wesley C. Davis, Ph. D., Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.
 Prof. John P. Deane, A. M., (Beloit College), 823 Church St., Beloit, Wis.
 Dean Dora K. Degen (Alfred University), 33 S. Main St., Alfred, N. Y.
 Chaplain Leonard DeMoor, Ph. D., Chaplain's Office, Hq. Troops, 96 Inf. Div., Camp White, Ore.
 Prof. Frederick M. Derwacter, Ph. D., (William Jewell College), 202 W. Franklin St., Liberty, Mo.
 Dean Rush M. Deskius, A. M., (Chapman College), 520 E. Philadelphia St., Whittier, Cal.
 Prof. L. Harold DeWolf, Ph. D., (Boston University), 156 Sumner St., Newton Center, 59, Mass.
 Rev. P. C. Dickenson, Concord Church (Presbyterian), Belmont, O.
 Pres. Charles Edward Diehl, D. D., LL. D., Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn.
 Prof. Elliot Van N. Diller, Ph. D., Mills College, Oakland, Cal.
 Pres. Aloys H. Dirksen, S. T. D., St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind.
 Mrs. Olive Dutcher Doggett (Mrs. Laurence), A. M., 153 Western Dr., Longmeadow, Mass.
 Prof. Edward E. Domm, A. M., (North Central College), 529 E. Chicago Ave., Naperville, Ill.
 Prof. W. N. Donovan, D. D., (Andover-Newton Theological School), 46 Waldorf Rd., Newton Highlands, 61, Mass.
 Rev. M. Everett Dorr, Th. M., Varina, Ia.

- Prof. Claude C. Douglas, Ph. D., D. D., (University of Southern California), 5722 Buena Vista Ter., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Prof. George S. Duncan, Ph. D., (Graduate School, American University), 2900 Seventy St., N. E., Washington, D. C.
 Prof. Marion Hiller Dunsmore, Ph. D., Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Prof. J. Leslie Dunstan, Ph. D., (University of Hawaii), P. O. Box 150, Honolulu, Hawaii.

E.

- Prof. Eugene K. Eakin, Ed. M., Findlay College, Findlay, O.
 Prof. J. Allen Easley, Th. M., D. D., Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.
 Prof. Homer Kingley Ebright, Baker University, Baldwin, Kan.
 Prof. Louise S. Eby, Ph. D., Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Prof. William Graham Echols, A. M., D. D., 614 Tenth Ave., Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Miss Grace Edwards, M. A., 5757 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Mr. N. Carl Elder, 120 Stewart Ave., Mansfield, O.
 Prof. Harrison S. Elliott, Ph. D., (Union Theological Seminary), 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Rev. Dr. Willis Elliott, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, 37, Ill.
 Prof. Calvert N. Ellis, Ph. D., (Juniata College), Huntingdon, Pa.
 Prof. Stephen J. England, Ph. D., (Phillips University), 2043 University Sta., Enid, Okla.
 Prof. J. S. Engle, A. M., (Otterbein College), 53 Glenwood Dr., Westerville, O.
 Prof. Morton Scott Enslin, Th. D., (Crozer Theological Seminary), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.
 Rev. Alfred W. Eppard, Th. B., (Faith Theological Seminary), 1521 W. 14th St., Wilmington, Del.
 Prof. Frank Otis Erb, Ph. D., (Colgate-Rochester Divinity School), 1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester, N. Y.
 Prof. Herbert Francis Evans, Ph. D., (Whittier College), 706 E. Sycamore Dr., Whittier, Cal.

F.

- Mrs. Sophia Lyon Fahs, A. M., (Union Theological Seminary), 99 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y.
 Prof. David E. Faust, Ph. D., Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.

1944]

MEMBERS OF ASSOCIATION

145

- Mr. J. Clayton Feaver, B. D., Berea College, Berea, Ky.
- Rabbi Morris M. Feuerlicht, B. H. L., A. B., (Butler University), 35 East 54th St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Prof. Floyd V. Filson, Th. D., D. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary) 859 Chalmers Pl., Chicago, 14, Ill.
- Prof. Wm. C. Finch, Ph. D., Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
- Prof. Jack Finegan, Lic. Th., (Iowa State College), 2 Beardshear Hall, Ames, Ia.
- Prof. Willis W. Fisher, Ph. D., University of Southern California, Box 154, Los Angeles, Cal.
- Prof. Sandford Fleming, Ph. D., (Berkeley Baptist Divinity School), 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Cal.
- Prof. John W. Flight, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Mrs. Josephine B. Folsom (Mrs. Milo G.), A. B., (Maine Central Institute), 10 Main St., Pittsfield, Me.
- Rev. Harry W. Foot, 32 N. Main St., Sharon, Mass.
- Rev. Willard Griffin Foote, S. T. M., 415 Englewood Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Rev. C. S. Forester, B. D., 408 N. Greenwood St., LaGrange, Ga.
- Pres. Charles E. Forlines, D. D., LL. D., Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md.
- Dr. Hazel E. Foster, Ph. D., 1414 E. 109th St., Cleveland, O.
- Prof. Wm. Mefford Fouts, Th. D., (Northern Baptist Theological Seminary), 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Midwest Sta., Chicago, Ill.
- Rev. George P. Fowler, S. L. B., B. D., 319 Humphrey, New Haven, 11, Conn.
- Prof. Henry Thatcher Fowler, Ph. D., Brown University, Harmony, R. I.
- Prin. Laura Fowler, A. B., Hannah More Academy, Reisterstown, Md.
- Mrs. Margery Fulton Freeman, A. B., 675 Magnolia Ave., Pasadena, Cal.
- Prof. Merton B. French, Ph. D., (Elon College), Box 233, Elon College, N. C.
- Prof. Robert R. Fritsch, A. M., D. D., (Muhlenberg College), 2220 Chew St., Allentown, Pa.
- Dean H. C. Garwood, (John B. Stetson University), 219 W. University Ave., Deland, Fla.
- Mrs. Winnona M. Gay, 13 Sterling Rd., Waltham, Mass.
- Dean Samuel S. George, S. T. D., University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Ia.
- Prof. Herbert Gezork, Ph. D., (Andover-Newton Theological School, and Wellesley College), 144 Institution Ave., Newton Center, Mass.
- Rev. S. B. M. Ghiselin, Leland, N. C.
- Prof. Felix Wilbur Gingrich, Ph. D., (Albright College), 1629 N. 11th, Reading, Pa.
- Dr. Beatrice L. Goff, Ph. D., c/o Mr. Franklin Dexter, 30 State St., Boston, Mass.
- Prof. Reuben A. Goodman, A. B., D. D., (Newberry College), 2102 College St., Newberry, S. C.
- Rev. A. W. Gordon, B. D., Sudan, Tex.
- Dean Thomas W. Graham, D. D., (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), Bosworth Hall, Oberlin, O.
- Pres. William Creighton Graham, Ph. D., D. D., (University of Manitoba), 41 Balmoral Pl., Winnipeg, Man., Can.
- Prof. Frederick Clifton Grant, D. D., Th. D., D. S. Litt., (Union Theological Seminary), 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
- Prof. J. A. Greene, S. T. M., Clark College, Atlanta, Ga.
- Dr. Homer Lamar Grice, A. M., D. D., 161 Eighth Ave., North, Nashville, Tenn.
- Prof. Ross J. Griffeth, Ph. D., Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Prof. Ivan Gerould Grimshaw, Ph. D., (American International College), R. F. D. No. 1, North Wilbraham, Mass.
- Mr. Louis J. Gross, A. B., 781 Harvard St., Rochester, N. Y.
- Dr. John M. Groton, A. M., S. T. D., (Philadelphia Divinity School), 4243 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Walter A. Groves, Ph. D., (Centre College), 2141 Baringer Ave., Louisville, Ky.
- Prof. W. B. Guerrant, A. M., S. T. D., Austin College, Sherman, Tex.
- Prof. Manford George Gutzke, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.

G

- Dr. Herbert M. Gale, Ph. D., (Northfield Seminary), 258 Main St., East Northfield, Mass.
- Dr. John Gardner, 67 Hilton Ave., Garden City, N. Y.

H

- Mr. Herbert F. Hahn, M. A., 318 West 89th St., New York, N. Y.
- Prof. Frank H. Hallock, S. T. D., LL. D., Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.
- Prof. Samuel L. Hamilton, B. D., New York University, Washington Sq. East, New York, N. Y.

- Prof. Harold F. Hanlin, A. M., School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Prof. Georgia E. Harkness, Ph. D., Litt. D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
- Mr. John Lincoln Harman, A. M., 815 First Pl., Plainfield, N. J.
- Prof. Joseph G. Haroutunian, Ph. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 2330 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
- Dr. Erdman Harris, Th. D., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
- Prof. Raymond S. Haupert, Ph. D., Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
- Rev. Charles A. Hawley, Ph. D., First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kan.
- Prof. Lowell B. Hazzard, Ph. D., (Illinois Wesleyan University), 1206 N. Prairie Ave., Bloomington, Ill.
- Pres. Edwin J. Heath, D. D., Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Pa.
- Prof. John D. Herr, Th. D., 111 W. Mt. Pleasant Ave., Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Clarence Horace Hewitt, A. M., Aurora College, Aurora, Ill.
- Rev. Ralph K. Hickok, A. M., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., Whytcole, Aurora-on-Cayuga, N. Y.
- Prof. John Harden Hicks, Ph. D., (Southern Methodist University), 3548 McFarlin Blvd., Dallas, Tex.
- Pres. T. Ross Hicks, Th.M., D. D., 3024 University Ave., (Wesley College), Grand Forks, N. D.
- Prof. D. Edmond Hiebert, Ph. D., Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kan.
- Prof. John G. Hill, Ph. D., D. D., (University of Southern California), 3600 Fairway Blvd., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Dr. Thomas E. Hill, 1961 Mignon Ave., Memphis, Tenn.
- Prof. Cecil E. Hinshaw, Th. M., Friends University, Wichita, Kan.
- Prof. Benjamin P. Hoffman, A. M., S. D. A., Theological Seminary, 201 Garland Ave., Takoma Pk., 12, Md.
- Dean R. W. Hoffman, A. M., Drury College, Springfield, Mo.
- Prof. Harland E. Hogue, B. D., (Scripps College), 860 Columbia St., Claremont, Cal.
- Rev. Norman A. Holmes, (Straight College), 2307 Bienville Ave., New Orleans, La.
- Prof. Elmer G. Homrichausen, Th. D., D. D., (Princeton Theological Seminary), 80 Mercer St., Princeton, N. J.
- Mr. Robert B. Hoople, A. M., 816 Westmoreland Ave., Syracuse, 10, N. Y.
- Miss Ruth A. Hoople, A. M., (Y. W. C. A.), 114 Prospect St., Passaic, N. J.
- Miss Lynn Horstman, M. A., (Adelphi College), 11 Massachusetts Blvd., Bellrose, N. Y.
- Prof. Horace T. Houf, L. H. D. (Ohio University), 17 Second St., Athens, O.
- Dean Lynn Harold Hough, Th. D., D. D., Litt. D., LL. D., L. H. D., J. U. D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
- Prof. John Howard Howson, A. M., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Miss M. Elisabeth Hudson, M. R. E., (Mississippi State College for Women), Box 1084, College Sta., Columbus, Miss.
- Rev. Norman Huffman, Ph. D., Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga.
- Rev. William E. Hunter, A. M., 214 W. 52nd St., Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Harold H. Hutson, Ph. D., Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.
- Prof. James Philip Hyatt, Ph. D., Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn.
- I.
- Rev. H. B. Ingalls, A. M., Northfield Seminary, East Northfield, Mass.
- J.
- Prof. Fleming James, Ph. D., D. D., (School of Theology, University of the South), Sewanee, Tenn.
- Prof. Charles K. Johnson, S. T. M., Alma College, Alma, Mich.
- Rev. F. Heisse Johnson, Brothers College, Drew University, Madison, N. J.
- Rev. George Johnson, Ph. D., R. D. No. 2, Mavern, Pa., c/o P. C. Garrett.
- Prof. Hansford D. Johnson, D. D., Mercer University, Macon, Ga.
- Dr. J. Glover Johnson, Th.D., Ph.D., Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.
- Dr. Lyman Schiller Johnson, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kan.
- Prof. Obadiah S. Johnson, Ph. D., (Wabash College), 105 Vernon Court, Crawfordsville, Ind.
- Prof. Paul E. Johnson, Ph. D., D. D., (Boston University School of Theology), 130 Day St., Auburndale, Mass.
- Rev. R. Park Johnson, Ph. D., 318 E. 55th St., Kansas City, 2, Mo.
- K
- Prof. Edwin Kagin, D. R. E., D. D., Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
- Prof. Edmund H. Kase Jr., Ph. D., (Grove City College), 504 Woodland Ave., Grove City, Pa.

- Prof. P. E. Keen, A. M., (Evangelical Theological Seminary), 209 N. Columbia St., Naperville, Ill.
 Prof. J. Calvin Keene, Ph. D., Howard University School of Religion, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Charles Foster Kent, The Elm Tree Inn, Farmington, Conn.
 Prof. Thomas Samuel Kepler, Ph. D., D. D., (Lawrence College), 908 E. Alton St., Appleton, Wis.
 Prof. E. D. Kerr, B. D., D. D., Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.
 Rev. Frank Melville Kerr, A. M., D. D., 353 Fulton Ave., Hempstead, N. Y.
 Prof. Bruce L. Kershner, A. M., Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Rabbi I. Edward Kiev, Jewish Institute of Religion, W. 68th St., New York, N. Y.
 Prof. Albion Roy King, Ph. D., Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Ia.
 Prof. George B. King, Ph. D., (United College), 1050 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man., Can.
 Dr. Rachel H. King, Ph. D., Revell Hall, East Northfield, Mass.
 Pres. Willis J. King, Ph. D., D. D., Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.
 Prof. Wilson R. King, M. R. E., (Greenville College), 321 N. Spruce St., Greenville, Ill.
 Dr. Gerald E. Knoff, Ph. D., (Iowa State Teachers College), 1009 W. 23rd St., Cedar Falls, Ia.
 Dr. Raymond C. Knox, B. D., S. T. D., Guilford, Conn.
 Prof. Ralph E. Knudsen, Th. D., 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, 4, Cal.
 Prof. Charles Franklin Kraft, Ph. D., Albion College, Albion, Mich.
 Prof. Theodore W. Kretschmann, Ph. D., (Susquehanna University), R. 1, Selins Grove, Pa.

L

- Prof. Mary E. Lakenan, A. M., Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.
 Prof. Elizabeth P. Lam, Ph. D., 1601 N. Ave. 46, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Prof. M. Willard Lampe, Ph. D., D. D., School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
 Prof. Elbert C. Lane, B. D., D. D., (Hartford Theological Seminary), 69 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.
 Prof. J. H. Langenwalter, S. T. M., D. D., P. O. Drawer 272, Reedley, Cal.
 Dean Frank Glenn Lankard, Ph. D., (Brothers College, Drew University), 11 Academy Rd., Madison, N. J.
 Prof. Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M., (Connecticut College), 57 Oneco Ave., New London, Conn.
- Prof. C. M. Laymon, S. T. B., Th. D., Scarritt College, 1008 19th St., Ave. S., Nashville, Tenn.
 Dr. J. Josephine Leamer, Th. D., 711 B St., Silver City, N. M.
 Prof. Howard F. Legg, 901 North Howard St., Indianola, Ia.
 Prof. Paul Lehmann, Th. D., (Wellesley College), 6 Shepard House, Wellesley, Mass.
 Mr. Thomas L. Leishman, S. T. M., 47 Palmer Rd., Waban, Mass.
 Prof. Addison H. Leitch, Th. M., (Grove City College), 601 Spring St., Grove City, Pa.
 Prof. Elmer A. Leslie, Ph. D., (Boston University School of Theology), 228 Mason Ter., Brookline, Mass.
 Prof. William R. Locke, Ph. D., Mount Union College, Alliance, O.
 Rev. R. Lincoln Long, D. D., 2108 Collingswood Blvd., Toledo, O.
 Prof. Robert Long, McMurray College, Abilene, Texas.
 Rev. S. Burman Long, A. M., D. D., Old South Congregational Church, South Weymouth, Mass.
 Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, Ph. D., (Illiff School of Theology), 2273 S. Filmore St., Denver, Colo.
 Prof. L. R. Loomis, Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.
 Prof. A. W. Loos, Ph. D., Spelman College, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.
 Rev. Julian Price Love, Ph. D., D. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 2119 Napoleon Blvd., Louisville, Ky.
 Prof. Florence B. Lovell, Ph. D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Chaplain A. Sidney Lovett, A. M., D. D., (Yale University), 202 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn.
 Prof. Martha B. Lucas, Ph. D., Westhampton College, Richmond, Va.
 Dean Mary Ely Lyman, Ph. D., Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
 Prof. Robert H. Lynn (University of Redlands), 122 The Terrace, Redlands, Cal.

Mc.

- Dr. Kathleen Walker MacArthur, Ph. D., (Y. W. C. A.), 600 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.
 Dr. Harvey McArthur, Ph. D., 20 Mendon St., Blackstone, Mass.
 Prof. Wm. A. McCall, Ph. D., Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr.
 Prof. Selby Vernon McCasland, Ph. D., (University of Virginia), 1852 Winston Ave., Charlottesville, Va.
 Pres. Alva J. McClain, Th. M., (Grace Theological Seminary), Winona Lake, Ind.

- Mrs. Mary McCoy, Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.
- Prof. Goldie McCue, M. R. E., (Ohio Wesleyan University), 232 W. William St., Delaware, O.
- Miss Myrtle A. McDaniel, (Y. W. C. A.), 59 Main St., Newton, N. J.
- Dr. Robert W. McEwen, Ph. D., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
- Prof. John R. McFadden, Ph. D., Litt. D., (Kansas Wesleyan University), 325 Sunset Drive, Salina, Kan.
- Prof. F. M. McGaw, A. M., Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.
- Prof. Dean G. McKee, Th. D., (The Biblical Seminary), 235 E. 49th St., New York, 17, N. Y.
- Prof. Ella Clare McKellar, Ph. D., Th. D., Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
- Rev. John W. McKelvey, Ph. D., 220 W. Godfrey Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Edgar Monroe McKown, Ph. D., (Evansville College), 617 S. Norman Ave., Evansville, Ind.
- Prof. Ralph E. McLain, Ph. D., Shorter College, Rome, Ga.
- Prof. W. H. McMaster, A. M., D. D., LL. D., (University of Miami), 824 Genoa St., Coral Gables, Fla.
- Mr. Sterling M. McMurrin, M. A., L. D. S., Institute of Religion, 1000 N. Mountain Ave., Tucson, Ariz.
- Mr. Glenn McRae, A. M., 2700 Pine St., St. Louis, Mo.

M

- Miss Louise B. Machen, B. D., 907 Poplar Hill Rd., Baltimore, Md.
- Prof. Earl L. Martin, A. M., D. D., Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson, Ind.
- Mrs. Frances H. Martin, (Mrs. John E.), A. M., Adrian College, 412 N. Broad St., Adrian, Mich.
- Dr. Ira J. Martin III, Th. D., 5 Greenwood Ter., Athol, Mass.
- Prof. Martha Martin, A. B., (Elizabethtown College), 68 E. Washington St., Elizabethtown, Pa.
- Prof. Charles D. Matthews, Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.
- Prof. Herbert Gordon May, Ph. D., (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), 237 College St., Oberlin, O.
- Prof. George N. Mayhew, Ph. D., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
- Prof. John E. Meeter, Th. M., (Wilson College), 131 Pennsylvania Ave., Chambersburg, Pa.
- Dr. Vartan D. Melconian, Ph. D., Presbyterian College of Christian Education, 832 Belden Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Mrs. Ruth Greer Melvin, C. S., 35 West 69th, New York, N. Y.
- Prof. Theophil W. Menzel, A. M., (Elmhurst College), 607 Berkeley St., Elmhurst, Ill.
- Rev. Bruce M. Metzger, Th. M., 37 N. Union St., Middletown, Pa.
- Prof. Burton Metzler, McPherson College, McPherson, Kan.
- Prof. George P. Michaelides, Ph. D., (Schauffler College), 5115 Fowler Ave., Cleveland, O.
- Rev. Robert C. Mildram, B. D., A. M., Mt. Hermon School, Box 084, Mt. Hermon, Mass.
- Prof. Adam W. Miller, A. M., D. D., (Anderson College), E. Fifth and Chestnut Sts., Anderson, Ind.
- Prof. Allen O. Miller, B. D., Ph. D., (Heidelberg College), 164 Ohio Ave., Tiffin, O.
- Prof. Alvin J. Miller, A. M., Room 1131, Baltimore Tr. Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
- Rev. Irving R. Miller, B. D., Box 283, Ansonville, N. C.
- Dr. Park Hays Miller, 1105 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Robert Henry Miller, A. M., D. D., (Manchester College), 606 E. Ninth St., North Manchester, Ind.
- Prof. John D. Mills, A. M., (Friends University), 1907 University Ave., Wichita, 12, Kan.
- Prof. Paul S. Minear, Ph. D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
- Mr. Robert M. Montgomery, B. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
- Pres. Dale Hendry Moore, Th. D., Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pa.
- Miss Dorothy M. Moore, 57 Ambrose St., Rochester, 6, N. Y.
- Dean George V. Moore, Ph. D., The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
- Prof. John M. Moore, Ph. D., (Swarthmore College), 512 Elm Ave., Swarthmore, Pa.
- Rev. Hugh A. Moran, Ph. D., (Cornell University), 309 Mitchell St., Ithaca, N. Y.
- Prof. George W. Morrell, (Church Divinity School of the Pacific), 2451 Ridge Rd., Berkeley, Cal.
- Miss Emily Morrison A. M., (University of Connecticut), Storrs, Conn.
- Prof. Ira A. Morton, (Iliff School of Theology), 2135 S. Josephine St., Denver, Col.
- Prof. William W. Morton, B. D., D. D., (Washington and Lee University), 303 S. Jefferson St., Lexington, Va.

Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, Ph. D., (Elmira College), 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.
 Rev. Phillips P. Moulton, 118 S. Eighth Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
 Miss Lucetta Mowry, 110 Linden St., New Haven, Conn.
 Prof. James Muilenburg, Ph. D., L. H. D., (Pacific School of Religion), 1798 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Cal.
 Prof. Hiram Earl Myers, S. T. M., (Duke University), 141 Pinecrest Rd., Durham, N. C.
 Miss Elfeda Myser, A. M., M. R. E., Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kan.

N.

Prof. Toyozo W. Nakarai, Ph. D., Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Mr. B. Davie Napier, B. D., Saundersville, Mass.
 Rev. Frank R. Neff, Jr., Th. M., Box 96, Everglades, Fla.
 Prof. Charles F. Nesbitt, Ph. D., Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
 Prof. Warren N. Nevius, A. M., D. D., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
 Dr. Jannette E. Newhall, Ph. D., Andover-Harvard-Theological Library, Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. Herbert L. Newman, Ph. D., (Colby College), 2 W. Court, Waterville, Me.
 Mr. Stewart A. Newman, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Hill, Tex.
 Miss Helen R. H. Nichol, A. M., The Masters School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
 Rev. Charles Francis Nims, Ph. D., 2404 Detroit Ave., Toledo, O.

O.

Miss Rosalie Vaden Oakes, 412 W. Clifford St., Winchester, Va.
 Prof. Morgan S. Odell, Ph. D., 0615 S. W. Palatine Hill Rd., Portland, Ore.
 Prof. John Orr, Ph. D., (Westminster College), 139 Beechwood Rd., New Wilmington, Pa.
 Dr. Albert Cook Outler, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.

P.

Dr. Caroline L. Palmer, A. M., Litt. D., (Biblical Seminary), 235 East 49th St., New York, N. Y.
 Mrs. Katharine Hazeltine Paton, B. D., The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 Prof. Charles H. Patterson, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Prof. Victor R. Pearson, S. T. D., Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.

Prof. Prentiss L. Pemberton, 335 Harvard St., Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. Joseph S. Pennebaker, Ph. D., Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.
 Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph. D., Litt. D., S. T. D., (Syracuse University), Lake Bluff, Wolcott, N. Y.
 Prof. Robert H. Pfeiffer, Ph. D., (Harvard University), 57 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. Paul E. Pfuetze, A. M., University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
 Prof. Charles H. Pickar, (Augustinian College), 3900 Harewood Rd., N. E., Washington, D. C.
 Rev. Ellis E. Pierce, Th. D., 23 Genesee St., Hornell, N. Y.
 Prof. Raymond F. Piper, Ph. D., Hall of Languages, Syracuse University, Syracuse, 10, N. Y.
 Headmaster David R. Porter, A. M., L. H. D., D. D., Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.
 Prof. A. B. Potorf, Th. D., American University, Washington, D. C.
 Rev. Vincent Fowler Pottle, Th. M., 4205 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dean Wm. H. Powers, A. B., D. D., Hendricks Chapel, Syracuse University, Syracuse, 10, N. Y.
 Dr. Francis W. Pritchard, First Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., W. Oak St. at Bolivar, Denton, Tex.
 Prof. Henry Prochazka, Ph. D., Shurtleff College, Alton, Ill.
 Prof. Alexander C. Purdy, Ph. D., (Hartford Theological Seminary), 96 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn.
 Prof. Carl E. Purinton, Ph. D., Box 7, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Prof. Charles Lynn Pyatt, B. D., The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

Q.

Miss Frances C. Query, 1004 W. Trinity Ave., Durham, N. C.
 Rev. Chester Warren Quimby, S. T. B., 277 Market St., Mifflinburg, Pa.

R.

Pres. J. B. Randolph, LL. D., Claflin University, Orangeburg, S. C.
 Prof. Morgan W. Redus, Ph. D., Southern Methodist University, Dallas, 5, Texas.
 Pres. Harry Lathrop Reed, D. D., S. T. D., (Auburn Theological Seminary), Salisbury, Conn.

- Prof. Lucius F. Reed, D. D., 1141 High St., Auburn, Cal.
- Miss Amy C. Rehfuss, A. B., The Masters School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
- Prof. G. Adolphus Richie, A. M., D. D., (Lebanon Valley College), 466 E. Main St., Annville, Pa.
- Miss Suzanne G. Rinck, A. M., (Baptist Missionary Training School), 2969 Vernon Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Dean Orland M. Ritchie, Ph. D., Allegheny College), 347 Ravine St., Meadville, Pa.
- Prof. M. E. Ritzman, Ph. D., (Evangelical School of Theology), 1518 N. 15th St., Reading, Pa.
- Prof. Corwin C. Roach, Ph. D., Bexley Hall of Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
- Prof. Charles H. Roberson, A. M., LL. D., (Abilene Christian College), Sta. A. Abilene, Tex.
- Miss Martha E. Robinson, M. A., 206 S. Madison St., Whiteville, N. C.
- Prof. Henry Barton Robison, Ph. D., Culver Stockton College, Canton, Mo.
- Rev. (Miss) Pueria B. Robison A. M., The Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y.
- Mrs. Katharine Richards Rockwell, Ph. D., 39 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Rev. Thomas Rogers, Th. D., 23 Garrison Rd., Brookline, 46, Mass.
- Dr. Trude Weiss Rosmarin, Ph. D., Suite 307, 110 W. 40th St., New York, N. Y.
- Prof. W. Gordon Ross, B. D., Ph. D., (Berea College), Berea College Station, Ky.
- Prof. Walter E. Roush, Ph. D., D. D., (Bonebrake Theological Seminary), 2129 Rugby Rd., Dayton, O.
- Mr. James Wilson Rowland, A. B., (Union College), 3626 S. 49th St., Lincoln, Neb.
- Prof. Donald T. Rowlingson, Ph. D., (Emory University), 2432 Westminster Way, N. E., Atlanta, Ga.
- Rabbi Louis Ruchames, B. S. S., M. A., 1423 University Ave., Tuscaloosa, Ala.
- Dean Elbert Russell, Ph. D., Litt. D., Duke University School of Religion, Durham, N. C.
- Prof. Henry Giffen Russell, A. M., (Bowdoin College), 11 Belmont St., Brunswick, Me.

S.

- Prof. Floyd L. Sampson, Th. D., (University of Denver), 2375 E. Evans St., Denver, Col.
- Mr. William L. Savage, A. B., (Chas. Scribner's Sons), 597 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Rev. John H. Scammon, S. T. M., 11 Nantucket Rd., Newton Highlands, Mass.
- Prof. Wm. J. Scarborough, Ph. D., Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.
- Prof. J. W. Schmalstieg, S. T. B., (University of South Dakota), 10 Linden Ave., Vermillion S. D.
- Prof. Herbert W. Schneider, Ph. D., 715 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Prof. Paul Schubert, Ph. D., (Hartford Theological Seminary), 55 Elisabeth St., Hartford, Conn.
- Dean Paul J. Schwab, Ph. D., Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.
- Rev. Stanley Scott, Librarian, Union College, Vancouver, Br. Col., Can.
- Prof. William Scott, Th. D., Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va.
- Rev. William R. Seaman, S. T. D., Souderton, Pa.
- Miss Ruth D. See, M. R. E., Stillman Institute, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
- Dean Arthur G. Sellen, Ph. D., Washburn University, Topeka, Kan.
- Prof. Ovid R. Sellers, Ph. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 2330 N. Halstead St., Chicago, Ill.
- Mr. Hardigg Sexton, Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind.
- Rev. Jacob Sheatsley, D. D., 960 Bryden Rd., Columbus, O.
- Prof. Franklin Irvin Sheeder, A. M., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
- Miss Cecilia May Sheppard, E. 15th St. and Denver Ave., Kansas City, Mo.
- Dr. Wilbur Spencer Sheriff, 19 Elm St., Coopers-town, N. Y.
- Prof. David C. Shipley, (University of Iowa), 20 Evans Ave., Woodlawn Apartments C-4, Iowa City, Ia.
- Dr. Howard Elmo Short, B. D., Ph. D., Hiram, O.
- Rev. Arthur R. Siebens, Litt. D., 2109 Scottwood Ave., Toledo, O.
- Dean Seth W. Slaughter, College of Bible, Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.
- Miss Ida Alice Sleeper, A. M., Simmons College, Boston, Mass.
- Rev. Charles W. F. Smith, B. D., Washington Cathedral, Mt. St. Alban, Washington, 16, D. C.
- Mr. Jesse F. Smith, A. B., (Suffield Academy), 347 Main St., Suffield, Conn.
- Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
- Rev. Roy S. Smyres, A. M., P. O. Box 116, Mon-tour Falls, N. Y.
- Prof. Heber C. Snell, Ph. D., (Latter Day Saints Institute), 908 S. Eighth Ave., Pocatello, Ida.
- Prof. R. Grady Snuggs, B. D., University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla.
- Rev. Carl Soule, Ph. D., 4845 Horger Ave., Dear-born, Mich.

- Prof. Earl E. Speicher, Ph. D., Northland College, Ashland, Wis.
- Mrs. Bessie Whitted Spence, A. M., (Duke University), Hope Valley, Durham, N. C.
- Prof. Charles D. Spotts, Smoketown, Pa.
- Prof. Paul W. Sprague, Ph. D., Wheaton College, Norton, Mass.
- Prof. Matthew P. Stapleton, D. D., St. John's Seminary, Brighton, 35, Mass.
- Prof. Algernon O. Steele, Ph. D., Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, N. C.
- Prof. Lucy E. Steele, A. M., Peace College, Raleigh, N. C.
- Pres. Theodore P. Stephens, Aurora College, Aurora, Ill.
- Rev. Howard S. Stephenson, A. M., (Transylvania College), 121 Clay St., Mount Sterling, Ky.
- Prof. Russell W. Stine, A. M., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
- Prof. William F. Stinespring, Ph. D., (Duke University Divinity School), 1107 Urban, Durham, N. C.
- Miss Lulu May Stipe, A. B., Box 116, Louisburg College, Louisburg, N. C.
- Mrs. Lessie Mae Hall Stone, A. M., (Huntingdon College), 6 College Ct., Montgomery, Ala.
- Dean E. H. Stranahan, A. M., D. R. E., William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia.
- Prof. Esther Stranahan, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia.
- Rev. Klaas Jacob Stratemeier, Th. D., (University of Dubuque Theological Seminary), 1876 Delhi St., Dubuque, Ia.
- Prof. W. E. Straw, A. M., (Emmanuel Missionary College), Route 1, Berrien Springs, Mich.
- Miss Maude Louise Strayer, A. B., The Masters School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
- Pres. Roy Strock, Andhra Christian College, Guntur, Madras Presidency, South India.
- Miss Veda Stryker, M. S., Pfeiffer Junior College, Misenheimer, N. C.
- Miss Lucy C. Sturgis, 66 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass.
- Prof. Ray Summers, Th. D., Seminary Hill, Texas.
- Mrs. Alma Willis Sydenstricker, 127 S. Greenwood St., Lebanon, Tenn.
- T.
- Rev. Norbert G. Talbott, Th. D., Central Methodist Church, Mary and Franklin Sts., Evansville, Ind.
- Prof. Eugene S. Tanner Ph. D., (University of Tulsa), 2747 E. Fifth Pl., Tulsa, Okla.
- Prof. George Spotswood Tarry, A. M., (Randolph-Macon College), P. O. Box 44, Ashland, Va.
- Mrs. Marion Monsell Taylor, A. M., 715 Quebec Pl., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. Mary Frances Thelen, S. T. M., Hollins College, Va.
- Prof. Virginia Thomas, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.
- Pres. French W. Thompson, Greenbrier College, Lewisburg, W. Va.
- Prof. Godfrey Tietze, A. M., University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.
- Prof. Ethel Tilley, Ph. D., Hastings College, Hastings, Neb.
- Mr. LeRoy E. Train, B. D., (North Park College), 6152 N. Kenmore Ave., Chicago, 40, Ill.
- Rev. John C. Trever, B. D., 944 Lincoln Blvd., Santa Monica, Cal.
- Mr. L. J. Trinterud, 914 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Alexander B. Trowbridge, (Rollins College), 192 Brewer Ave., Winter Park, Fla.
- Prof. Daniel Curtis Troxel, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
- Prof. Russell C. Tuck, S. T. M., (Andover-Newton Theological School), 102 Institution Ave., Newton Center, Mass.
- V.
- Rev. Thomas Van Loon, B. D., Hendricks Chapel, Syracuse University, Syracuse, 10, N. Y.
- Miss Helen T. Van Voast, B. D., (Northfield Seminary), East Gould Hall, East Northfield, Mass.
- Prof. Herbert S. Van Wyk, S. T. M., Central College, Pella, Ia.
- Pres. Earl Vinie, Ph. D., (Schauffler College), 5115 Fowler Ave., Cleveland, O.
- Rev. Elmer E. Voelkel, B. D., 816 Park Ave., Beloit, Wis.
- W.
- Chaplain Herndon Wagers, A. M., Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich.
- Rev. Clarence Almon Wagner, A. M., 54 College Ave., Medford, Mass.
- Rev. James E. Wagner, B. D., (Franklin and Marshall Academy), 338 College Ave., Lancaster, Pa.
- Prof. George Handy Wailes, A. M., D. D., (Temple University), 517 S. 48th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Rollin H. Walker, Ph. D., (Ohio Wesleyan University), 173 N. Sandusky St., Delaware, O.

- Prof. William G. Waltmeyer, Ph. D., (Gettysburg College), 251 Springs Ave., Gettysburg, Pa.
- Prin. George A. Walton, The George School, George School, Pa.
- Prof. Leroy Waterman, Ph. D., Litt. D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Prof. Ernest C. Webb, S. T. B., D. D., Box 203, S. M. U. Station, Dallas, Texas.
- Prof. James A. Weber, B. D., (Indiana Central College), 1526 Castle Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Dr. Virgil C. Welch, A. M., D. D., Barbourville, Ky
- Rev. Edric Amory Weld, Holderness School, Plymouth, N. H.
- Prof. John Mason Wells, A. M., D. D., Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.
- Prof. Herbert H. Wernecke, Ph. D., (Eden Theological Seminary), 518 Lake Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.
- Prof. W. B. West Jr., A. M. (George Pepperdine College), 1121 W. 79th St., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Rev. Wesley M. Westerberg, B. D., 2212 Ridge Ave., Evanston, Ill.
- Mr. Wendell Wheeler, A. M., Carleton College, Box 633, Northfield, Minn.
- Rev. Lionel A. Whiston, Jr., B. D., 1 Hanover St., Newbury, Mass.
- Prin. Sara B. Whitaker, (Northampton School for Girls), 78 Pomeroy Terrace, Northampton, Mass.
- Dean C. Vin White Th. M., (University of Dubuque Seminary), 1087 Mt. Loretta, Dubuque, Ia.
- Prof. Arthur C. Wickenden, Ph. D., (Miami University), Bonham Rd., Oxford, O.
- Dr. Gould Wickey, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., Suite 106, 744 Jackson Pl., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. Laura H. Wild, D. B., 467 W. Eighth St., Claremont, Cal.
- Prof. Amos N. Wilder, Ph. D., 5757 University Ave., Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
- Pres. Clyde E. Wildman, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
- Miss Katharine M. Wilkinson, (Chapin School), 145 E. 74th St., New York, N. Y.
- Prof. Bert C. Williams, S. T. B., A. M., (Chapman College), 520 E. Philadelphia St., Whittier, Cal.
- Prof. J. Paul Williams, Ph. D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Prof. Walter G. Williams, Ph. D., Iliff School of Theology, University Park, Denver, 10, Colo.
- Prin. Mira B. Wilson, S. T. B., LL. D., Northfield Seminary, East Northfield, Mass.
- Prof. Olive M. Winchester, Th. D., 1232 Oxford Ave., Pasadena, 7, Cal.
- Miss D. Helen Wolcott, B. D., (Y. W. C. A.), 338 First Ave., N., St. Petersburg, Fla.
- Prof. Arthur Whiting Wolfe, Th. D., (College of Emporia), 631 Arundel Ave., Emporia, Kan.
- Prof. M. R. Wolfe, Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va.
- Prof. Rolland Emerson Wolfe, Ph. D., (Crane Theological School, Tufts College), Miner Hall, Tufts College, Mass.
- Rabbi Louis Wolsey, D. D., 615 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Dr. Lynn H. Wood, Ph. D., (S. D. A. Theological Seminary), Takoma Park St., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. G. Ernest Wright, Ph. D., (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 842 Chalmers Pl., Chicago, Ill.
- Z.
- Prof. Harley H. Zeigler, Ph. D., University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Chaplain John D. Zimmerman, A. M., U. S. N. R., U. S. S. Miami, c/o Fleet P. O., New York, N. Y.

Does your library subscribe to the Journal? If not, won't you make a point of speaking to the librarian about the value of such a subscription? We now have 75-80 libraries on our list, but should like to have still more.